

JOHN BARTRAM HOUSE & GARDEN, HOUSE
54th St. & Lindbergh Blvd.

HALS No. PA-1-A

Philadelphia
Philadelphia County
Pennsylvania

PHOTOGRAPHS

PAPER COPIES OF COLOR TRANSPARENCIES

WRITTEN HISTORICAL AND DESCRIPTIVE DATA

REDUCED COPIES OF MEASURED DRAWINGS

National Park Service
U.S. Department of the Interior
1849 C St. NW
Washington, DC 20240

HISTORIC AMERICAN BUILDINGS SURVEY

JOHN BARTRAM HOUSE AND GARDEN, HOUSE

HALS No. PA-1-A

NOTE: This historical report and the associated drawings and photographs from the Summer 2001 survey augment existing Historic American Buildings Survey documentation, HABS No. PA-1132. This documentation includes eight sheets of drawings from 1940. These were based on measured drawings completed ca. 1921 for the Committee on Preservation of Historic Monuments, part of the Philadelphia Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, as part of planning for the house's first restoration. Seven of the eleven black and white photographs included in the documentation capture these earlier drawings. It should be noted that Updated drawings of the house were completed in order to further define the structure's numerous irregularities and to provide computer-based files for current and future conservation work.

Location: 54th Street and Lindbergh Boulevard, Philadelphia, Independent City, Pennsylvania.

Present Owner: City of Philadelphia.

Occupant: John Bartram Association.

Present Use: Historic house museum and the John Bartram Association offices.

Significance: The John Bartram House was the sole residence of John Bartram (1699–1777), the well-known early American botanist, explorer, and plant collector between 1731 and his death. William Bartram (1739–1823)—author of *Travels...* (1791)—continued his father's legacy as a naturalist and gardener, and resided at the house until his passing. The present two-and-one-half story stone house, a combination of vernacular form and high-style detail and organization, resulted from a number of construction campaigns and alterations completed, largely by Bartram, between 1728 and 1770. His granddaughter Ann Bartram Carr and her husband Robert Carr made changes to the house after their 1809 marriage, most notably the addition of the third-story dormers. As John Bartram was responsible for the original house and most of its later expansion, the dwelling and its changes most clearly reflect Bartram's skill as a mason, his personality, and his changing social position over the course of the eighteenth century.

Historian: James A. Jacobs, Summer 2001.

PART I: HISTORICAL INFORMATION

A. Physical History:

1. Date of erection: The core of the present house was started after John Bartram purchased the tract in 1728 and the structure's exterior shell was completed in 1731, as indicated by a lintel stone in the south third-floor wall.¹ An integral kitchen was added next, probably in the mid-1740s. By 1758, work was already started on the enlargement and aggrandizement of the house upwards and eastwards. Construction was completed around 1770.²
2. Architect-builder: There was no architect for the John Bartram House in a modern sense of the term. Given both the dearth of trained professionals in the colonies throughout the eighteenth century and the largely vernacular form and accretive construction of the John Bartram House, it is doubtful that a trained architect or even a gentleman amateur gave much input on what was essentially a commodious and well-appointed farm dwelling.

Evidence indicates that the house's structural and decorative stonework was quarried, cut, and laid-up by or under the direction of John Bartram. In 1757, Bartram wrote:

I tould thee that I had been informed that ye grinding & mill stones was split in some countreys with driving woden pegs round A cilinder but not that your rocks would split after that manner but that I could split them & that I had been used to split rocks to make steps, dore-sills & large windo cases & stone pig troughs...I have split rocks 17 foot long & built five houses of hewn stones split out of ye rock with my own hands & very easy pleasant work it is but ye raising them up is very hard & must be done with iron bars & levers.³

¹For the purposes of this report, use of "John Bartram" indicates John Bartram, Sr. (1699–1777); "John Bartram, Jr." refers to his son (1743–1812).

²The house is not oriented true to the compass. For simplicity, the following designations will be used: the river front faces southeast and will be called "east;" the southwest wall with the conservatory will be "south;" the northwest wall will be "west;" and the northeast wall will be "north."

³John Bartram to Jared Eliot, 24 January 1757. John Bartram's formal education did not extend beyond basic literacy and throughout his life Bartram's written correspondence was plagued with grammatical mistakes and misspellings. William J. Scheik, in "Telling A Wonder: Dialectic in the Writings of John Bartram," *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 107:2 (1983): 235–248, notes that even Bartram's close friends—Peter Collinson and Peter Kalm, men who respected his breadth of understanding on an array of topics—offered commentary on his inability to write correctly. In a 3 November 1754 letter to Peter Collinson, Bartram both acknowledged as well as justified this deficiency: "good grammar & good spelling may please those that are more taken with A fine superficial flourish then real truth but my chief aim was to inform my readers of ye true real distinguishing characters of each genus." *In this report, direct quotations from Bartram's correspondence will not include "[sic]" following mistakes, otherwise the passages would be riddled with them.* All direct quotes from Bartram letters are drawn from *The Correspondence of John Bartram, 1734–1777*, ed. Edmund Berkeley and Dorothy Smith Berkeley (Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 1992).

While one of the houses was likely his own and another the residence of his son James, constructed sometime in the 1750s, the location, ownership, and function of the “five houses of hewn stones” to which he refers is not verifiably known. However, the large slabs of stone present in the east façade of the John Bartram House could have easily been derived by the common quarrying and cutting processes articulated later in the same letter.

My method is to draw A line upon ye rock that I want to split from one end to ye other and in ye middle in which I bore holes according to ye depth or toughness thereof...ye depth of ye rock adds to ye difficulty but ye length & breadth nothing, onely more wedges is required. there must be twice as many wedges as holes & one half made rather longer than ye hole is deep & rounded at one end Just fit to drop down to ye bottom of ye hole: ye others A little longer & bigger one way to open ye stone both blunted pointed ye upper one sharp & all ye holes must have thair wedges drove together one after another gently that ye rock may be strained equally alike from one end to ye other...you may hear by thair sound when they all strain alike then with ye sharp end of your Sledge or maul strike several smart stroaks in ye line between every one of ye wedges & at each end where you would have ye rock to split then drive all ye wedges again & it mostly will open from end to end if ye rock be sound. then with iron bars or long levers rais them up & lay ye pieces flat then bore & split them in what shape & dimentions you please: if ye rock is anything free thay will split allmost as true as hewed timber & by this method you may split allmost any rock for you may add what power you please by boreing ye holes deeper & closer together.⁴

Thus, while John Bartram was not a mason by trade, at some point in his life he learned quarry, cut, and lay-up stone. In addition to this, his statement that he was responsible for the crafting of “steps, dore-sills & large windo cases” indicates that he was most likely knowledgeable in the more refined stone carving process as well. The window surrounds on the east face support this claim as the jambs and lintels were constructed of single pieces of stone similar to those used elsewhere in the façade, with their faces decoratively rendered.

Despite his obvious knowledge of stone construction, Bartram probably consulted with professional masons during the various construction campaigns and surely hired carpenters and other craftsmen to assist in aspects of the design and building process. Bartram’s correspondence reveals that he was well-acquainted with Edmund Woolley.⁵ Woolley was a Philadelphia carpenter who ultimately became the master craftsman for the

⁴Bartram to Eliot, 24 January 1757.

⁵While no letters between Woolley and Bartram survive, between 1737 and 1742 there are seven references in the Bartram-Collinson correspondence to Woolley and Bartram’s mutual interests in natural history, travel, and collecting. None of the letters include any information related to buildings, design, or construction, rather, they establish an intimacy between Bartram and Woolley that makes consultation on such topics both possible and likely.

Pennsylvania State House construction from around 1735 until the completion of the bell tower in 1753.⁶ It is likely that John Bartram would have capitalized on such a valuable personal resource for aid in working through more difficult aspects of the design and construction.

3. Original and subsequent owners:⁷

1648—Swedish settler Hans Månsson and his family most likely moved from Kingsessing to Aronameck along the Schuylkill River. Peter Jochimson had already taken up residence there with his wife Ella Steelman. At some time before 1654, Månsson's wife died and in July 1654 he married Ella Steelman; Jochimson had died while on a diplomatic mission to New Amsterdam.⁸

1669—Hans Månsson received an official patent for the Aronameck plantation. In 1655, the Dutch defeated the Swedes and took control of the Delaware Valley. During their nine years of control, they issued land patents to Swedish settlers already in the area, however no patent for the Aronameck plantation survives, if any ever existed. Despite this oversight or undocumented issuance, Hans Månsson clearly remained there for on May 14, 1669, the English—who defeated the Dutch in 1664—“issued a patent for three tracts of land then in the ‘tenure or occupation of Hans Monsen,’ the largest of which was Aronameck, then described as 100 acres.”⁹ The patent was reissued by Francis Lovelace, governor of New York, on March 10, 1670 for 1,000 acres; a 1675 resurvey of the land set the Aronameck acreage at 1,100.¹⁰ While this tract of land included the section that would ultimately become “Bartram’s Garden,” Swedish settlement at this time probably remained to the south of the present house and outbuildings.¹¹

⁶Edward M. Riley, “The Independence Hall Group,” *Historic Philadelphia: From the Founding until the Early Nineteenth Century, Papers Dealing with its people and Buildings with an Illustrative Map*, (Philadelphia, 1953), issued as *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society*, 43, pt. 1, 13–17.

⁷Unless otherwise noted, all of the ownership information up through John Bartram, Sr.’s tenure was taken from an unpublished memorandum from Peter Stebbins Craig to Joel T. Fry, Curator of Historic Collections, Historic Bartram’s Garden, dated 7 April 1999. The pertinent information is found in the section entitled “Kingsessing Township Land Records, 1638–1777.” This unpublished memorandum is located in the John Bowman Bartram Special Collections Library (hereafter JBBSCL) at Historic Bartram’s Garden. Craig has authored a number of works related to Swedish settlement of the Delaware Valley in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, including: “The Yocums of Aronameck in Philadelphia, 1648–1702,” *National Genealogical Society Quarterly* 71:4 (December 1983): 243–279 and *The 1693 Census of the Swedes on the Delaware* (Winter Park, FL: SAG Publications, 1993).

⁸Craig “Yocums,” 251.

⁹*Ibid.*, 253.

¹⁰Craig, “Yocums,” 253, for dates and acreage; Jeff L. Kenyon, Stan M. Hunter, Helen Schenck, “Basic Historic Research and Archaeological Feasibility Study of Bartram Park,” Museum Historic Research Center, Philadelphia, 1975, 2, JBBSCL, for governor.

¹¹Joel T. Fry, “Phase I Archaeological Survey of the Proposed Wetland Restoration Site: Historic Bartram’s Garden,” vol. 1, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1996, 9, JBBSCL.

1681—Hans Månsson sold the Aronameck plantation to his stepson Peter Peterson Yocum; Yocum conveyed a 270-acre portion to Jonas Nilsson. The roughly 1150-acre tract was purchased by Yocum on April 29; Månsson and his family moved onto lands acquired in Delaware. On April 30, Yocum transferred 270 acres to Nilsson, his father-in-law.¹² “Final execution of [the deed]...was delayed pending a resurvey of the bounds of the Aronameck plantation purchased from Hans Månsson.”¹³

1693—Mounce Jones inherited a roughly 100-acre portion of the former Aronameck plantation. By 1686–1687, Mounce or Mountz Jones (Måns Jonasson) had moved onto his father’s 270-acre tract. This land was noted as entirely forested and uncleared as late as 1683. His father died in October 1693 at which time the tract was divided between Jonasson and two of his brothers. Mounce Jones retained a 102-acre portion extending along the Schuylkill River.

1712—Mounce Jones sells the 102-acre tract to Frederick Schaffenhause (Schobbenhausen). By 1704, Jones had most likely vacated his portion of Aronameck and moved his family to Manatawney, further up the Schuylkill River. On November 19, 1712, Jones sold his 102-acres and 5 acres of marshland to Schaffenhause, his brother-in-law, for £75.¹⁴

1728—John Bartram purchased the 102-acre Schaffenhause tract at sheriff’s sale. After his death late in the 1720s, Schaffenhause’s estate was sued by his widow’s son by a previous marriage and the acreage was auctioned at sheriff’s sale in order to settle the debt.¹⁵ John Bartram purchased the property and an additional 10.5 acres of marsh and meadowland for £145 and the land was conveyed by deed on September 13, 1728.

1735—Bartram purchased a tract made up of 142+ acres adjacent to his property from Andrew Jonason (Jones) on September 4 for £283.

1739—Bartram added to his holdings purchasing 50 acres and 10 acres of marshland from the estate of Gertrude Supplee executed by her son Andrew Souplis, Jr. on April 3 for £175.

1739/40—Bartram sold 33+ acres of marsh and meadowland to Nathan Gibson on March 17 for £120.

¹²Philadelphia County Records, Patent Book A-1-369, as noted by Fry in HALS PA-1, 14.

¹³Craig, memorandum, 7.

¹⁴Deed, Mouns Johannes to Frederick Schobbenhausen, 9 June 1712, deed book E-7-9-19.

¹⁵Deed, Owen Owen (sheriff) to John Bartram, 30 September 1728, deed book GWC-41-356.

1777—Bartram, Sr. died and his will split the Kingsessing land between his sons James Bartram and John Bartram, Jr.¹⁶ John Bartram, Jr. received 139 acres—“all my plantation whereon we live, situated between David Gibson’s land & my son James Bartram’s land with all the appurtenances belonging to it, both upland & meadows [*sic*].”¹⁷ This portion included John Bartram’s stone house, outbuildings, and botanical garden.

1812—John Bartram, Jr. died; his 1809 will stipulated that the 139-acre tract would be shared by his three children Mary Jones, Ann Carr, and James H. Bartram. In 1814, the acreage was formally split among the siblings and Ann Carr received 32 acres that included the house and gardens. Six additional acres of land owned by James J. Bartram were purchased by the Carrs on January 1, 1846.

1850—Robert and Ann Carr sold both the 32- and 6-acre tracts to Andrew Eastwick. On July 3, 1847, the 32-acre tract with the house and gardens went to sheriff’s sale and was purchased by Robert Smethurst. Smethurst sold the property back to the Carrs on the same day. The Carrs’ financial troubles did not end and they sold both tracts to Eastwick on April 23, 1850; he also purchased 8+ acres from Mary Jones on that day. On March 6, 1851, Lewis Jones, on behalf of Mary Jones, sold 9 ³/₄+ acres more to Eastwick, bringing the total of his holdings to 56+ acres. Eastwick continued to make land purchases that eventually came close to doubling the 1851 acreage.

1893—As administrators of Eastwick’s estate, the Pennsylvania Company for Insurance (PCI) sold two portions of his lands to the City of Philadelphia. Eastwick died in 1879 and, as stipulated in his will, the PCI took control of his estate. A city ordinance dated March 12, 1889 authorized the appropriation of monies for the 11+-acre Bartram Park.¹⁸ While taking control of the property and opening the new public park in 1891, it was not until May 23, 1893 that the City of Philadelphia finalized the purchase, an 8.74-acre tract that included the house and gardens and a 2.34-acre tract to the west across the railroad tracks.

1897—PCI sold a third tract of 16.213 acres to the City of Philadelphia to augment the size of “Bartram Park.” The total acreage of the park then stood at 27.293. This purchase included the Eastwick mansion, Bartram Hall, however, the city demolished the house before the year’s end.

¹⁶Unless otherwise noted, all of the later ownership information is culled from Kenyon et al.

¹⁷Last Will and Testament of John Bartram, 17 January 1772, copy in the Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

¹⁸City Ordinance, 12 March 1889, tss. by George B. McCracken, Real Estate Officer, City of Philadelphia, 2 June 1938, Fairmount Park Commission, Memorial Hall.

1981—The City of Philadelphia purchased 17+ acres to the north of the existing Bartram Park from the Warner Company on February 9.¹⁹ As early as 1910 the City might have contemplated the purchase of additional acreage. A city survey of 17.083 adjacent acres was executed in that year, but there is no evidence action went beyond this survey as indicated by a 1929 ground rent agreement that included the site north of Bartram Park.²⁰ A City Ordinance dated December 22, 1980, authorized the purchase of these 17+ acres by the Fairmount Park Commission.²¹ A later application for monetary assistance in the purchase from the Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund placed the “Bartram Park Expansion” at 16.7 acres.²²

Since that time, in 1998 an additional triangular plot of slightly less than one acre located north of the approach road and west of the railroad tracks was purchased. The total acreage of Bartram Park stands at roughly 45.5 acres.²³

4. Original and subsequent occupants:

The house remained the residence of John Bartram, his family, and some descendents from the completion of the house’s first phase in 1731 until its sale by Robert and Ann Bartram Carr to Andrew Eastwick in 1850. While never owning the house or the surrounding acreage, William Bartram—John Bartram’s son and a noted botanist, explorer, and writer in his own right—resided in the John Bartram House for most of his life.

Andrew Eastwick and his family temporarily lived in the dwelling during 1850 and 1851 while their large new house—Bartram Hall—was completed on plans by Samuel Sloan. After 1851, the residence’s function becomes sketchy and appears to have periodically changed. It has been suggested that the dwelling alternately served as service space, a guesthouse, and a backdrop for social functions. There is also evidence that at least two of Eastwick’s sons lived in the house with their families for periods of uncertain length.²⁴ When the City of Philadelphia took control of the property, Eastwick tenant Robert J. (John M?) Rule and his family were residing in the house; Rule was

¹⁹Deed, Warner Company to the City of Philadelphia, 9 February 1981, deed book D-153-367.

²⁰Ground rent agreement, F. W. Bacon et Ux to Warner Company, 12 April 1929, copies in JBSCL.

²¹City Ordinance, 22 December 1980, Fairmount Park Commission, Memorial Hall.

²²“Bartram Park Expansion,” mss. Fairmount Park Commission, Memorial Hall., for acreage; Fry, “Phase I...,” 147, for grant agency.

²³Joel T. Fry, Curator of Historic Collections, Historic Bartram’s Garden, to author, electronic correspondence, 4 December 2001.

²⁴Joseph L. Eastwick, “Speech Given at the John Bartram Colonial Evening,” 25 September 1982, tss. JBSCL; Winslow Whiting, “Charles H. Eastwick,” January 1963, tss. JBSCL, taken from handwritten memoirs by Charles H. Eastwick.

named “Superintendent” of Bartram Park in March 1891.²⁵ From that time until the construction of a small “cottage” on park property in 1919–1920, the family of the caretaker/groundskeeper lived in the John Bartram House.²⁶

For most of the twentieth century, the John Bartram Association used various spaces in the house for meetings, exhibits, and storage. By early in the 1980s, the John Bartram Association offices were staffed full-time and restricted to the newly climate-controlled third-floor.

5. Builder, contractor, suppliers:

As previously noted, John Bartram quarried much of the house’s stone on his own and adjacent properties along the Schuylkill River. Extant evidence does not name any other contractor, supplier, or tradesman associated directly with the house’s construction.

There are few and infrequent references to small quantities of building materials in his correspondence. In a March 12, 1735/1736 letter to Bartram, Peter Collinson—his close friend and English business agent—noted that “the Cask of Nails is shipped by the St. George [under] Capt. Lindsay.”²⁷ Despite this and a few other references, it is never clear whether any of the mentioned materials were ultimately used in the house.

6. Original plans and construction:

Introduction

Much is known about the John Bartram House. Verifiable dates and associated documents are plentiful. The gardens—and by extension the house—were visited and described from the mid-eighteenth century onward. As one of the earliest municipal-owned house museums in the country and the active interest of the John Bartram Association, the house’s preservation and extensive documentation both in print and in photograph was assured. This extensive primary and secondary documentation, paradoxically, has not clarified but rather created confusion regarding when the house’s various components were constructed. While the well-chronicled restoration completed in 1926 was comparatively advanced in its methodology and in its

²⁵Articles in the 1890s that noting the superintendent of the park alternately refer to “John M.” and “Robert J.” Rule, it is believed that these references are to the same person. “Bartram’s Garden...,” *The Public Ledger*, 16 March 1891, JBBSCCL.

²⁶“In Bartram’s Garden—The Present Condition of the Old Botanist’s Famous Property—Much Restoration Needed...,” no given newspaper, ca. March 1891, JBBSCCL, Dr. John B. Bartram Collection, for Rule residency in 1891. John W. Harshberger, *The Botanists of Philadelphia and Their Work* (Philadelphia, 1899), 60, for continued Rule occupancy. “City Will Fully Restore Old Bartram Mansion,” *The Evening Bulletin*?, 3 May 1919, JBBSCCL, for continued occupancy and contract award for caretaker house construction.

²⁷Collinson to Bartram, 12 March 1735/1736.

execution, only in the last quarter century has serious and in-depth studies of the house's extant fabric taken place. Yet even with up-to-date archaeology, paint and mortar analysis, and invasive exploration associated with the 1980 restoration, recent conclusions about the house's construction chronology remain—inconclusive.

While it is the desire of historians to provide the most succinct and decisive account of a building's past, unfortunately, this desire is not entirely fulfilled with the case of the John Bartram House. Previous physical studies associated with both the 1926 and 1980 restorations lacked the historical knowledge and vastly improved fieldwork methodology of the last twenty years; conversely, the HABS summer survey team lacked the ability to pull up floorboards and pull down plaster. Before offering a plausible and probable chronology of construction, it is first necessary to address some problems associated with this site's interpretation and construction chronology.

There is a surprising lack of construction seams not only where they are expected but also where they should verifiably be. A 1758 drawing is a font of useful information about the house, unfortunately it was not closely analyzed in the past.²⁸ While previously thought to be executed by John Bartram, the drawing technique and handwritten title across the top are his son William's.²⁹ It was sent in a letter to Peter Collinson early in 1759 and presently resides in the Earl of Darby Collection, Knowsley Hall, near Liverpool, England.

The drawing is recognizably the John Bartram House with the original unit (Phase I) and the kitchen extension to the north (Phase II), as well as the beginnings of the enlargement and aggrandizement of the house (Phase III). The face of the house is composed of rectilinear stone blocks laid-up in regular courses. This regular stone face is problematic when considering the addition of the southern ell, which was not constructed at the time of the drawing. The south ell was appended to the east façade sometime in the 1760s and there should be some indication of the seam on the south wall. Beyond the stones being somewhat larger in the vicinity of this "joint," however, no seam exists. While logic dictates that Bartram would not have undermined his house's stability by removing stone blocks at this corner to key-in less regular stones—thus eliminating a seam in the rubble-stone wall—it appears that this is exactly what he did as the construction chronology is known at this junction. Perhaps he did this because the wall may not have been stuccoed-over at the time; galleting appears to have been used in laying up the south wall of the ell.

²⁸See field notes for visual.

²⁹Thomas P. Slaughter, *The Natures of John and William Bartram* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1996), 35.

Additional vaguaries stem from the fact that the house has gone through two comprehensive restorations; each time different features and parts were altered, repaired, replaced, or moved. Fortunately, much of this change was well documented.

Finally, the John Bartram House was a work of John Bartram's entire adult life. As owner, builder, and occupant, he no doubt tinkered with the house between bona fide "construction campaigns." Despite these complexities, much of the extant fabric reads clearly and when coupled with eighteenth-century documentary evidence, a plausible outline of construction can be formulated.

The John Bartram House: Construction Chronology

This report offers a timeline of construction and change that is distinct from the two prior reports focusing on the house—the ca. 1921 restoration proposal and the 1978 historic structures report—while at the same time incorporating aspects of each. This construction history is based not only on careful study of a particularly extensive corpus of primary and secondary sources, but also by continual on-site fieldwork and close scrutiny of the first architectural drawings accurately depicting the out-of-plumb state of the structure.

The Swedish Question

Much of the past architectural historical scholarship has dealt unsatisfactorily with the "stone Swedish structure" believed to form the core of the house. This report proposes that there is no masonry structure of Swedish design imbedded in the John Bartram House.

Between 1637 and 1655, eleven ships carrying 600 Swedes arrived in North America; these people settled around Fort Christina (Wilmington, Delaware) and attempted to carve-out a life in New Sweden.³⁰ There were 300 Swedes and Finns present in the colony when the Dutch took over in 1655. Despite the turnover, the Dutch retained a laissez-faire power arrangement with the former "Swedish and Finnish Nation."³¹ After a period of somewhat chaotic government for the area of Swedish settlement following the English defeat of the Dutch in 1664, many of the original Swedish claims to the land were officially re-patented with William Penn after 1681. Those Swedes living on

³⁰Craig, *Census*, 1–2.

³¹Ibid., 4–5, for "Swedish and Finnish Nation." The settlers arriving in New Sweden were not all of Swedish extraction. At the time, Sweden controlled portions of present-day Finland and many of the arrivals were Savo-Karelian Finns. Unless otherwise stated, in this report "Swedes" will provide a blanket term for both groups. See Terry G. Jordan, "The Material Cultural Legacy of New Sweden on the American Frontier," *New Sweden in America*, eds. Carol E. Hoffecker, Richard Waldron, Lorraine E. Williams, and Barbara E. Benson (Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 1995), 302.

land platted for the new City of Philadelphia were relocated to Manatawney (Douglassville), a 10,000-acre tract located on the Schuylkill River in present-day Berks County.³²

Despite their small numbers, the Swedes maintained a cultural presence in the area well after the establishment of Pennsylvania. Late in the 1690s, Swedish missionaries replenished cultural reserves through renewed religious associationism, education, and the construction of two new church buildings—Holy Trinity at Wilmington (1699) and Gloria Dei at Wicaco in “Southwark” (1700).³³ The ever-increasing numbers of Englishmen in the Delaware Valley probably drove the reaffirmation of Swedish presence in the area. Andreas Rudman, pastor of the Wicaco church just south of Philadelphia noted in a 1697 letter that “the [Swedish] people live far separated and scattered” and in reference to the Quakers “the whole country is, God help us, filled with these weeds.”³⁴ The contributions of the Swedes and the Savo-Karelian Finns to North America lived on after the dilution of Swedish national identity in the form of frontier notched log construction, single (“cabin”) and double (“dog-trot”) plans, split rail fencing, and hunting lean-tos.³⁵

That the Swedes were building domestic and farm structures primarily if not entirely of wood has been underscored in a number of sources. In 1683, Thomas Paschal, one of the first Englishmen to live among the Swedes in Kingsessing, marveled at the woodworking prowess of the Swedes. They “will cut down a tree...sooner than two men can saw him [*sic*], and rend him [*sic*] into planks or what they please, [using] only the ax and wooden wedges.”³⁶ Rudman’s aforementioned 1697 letter noted that in his Wicaco parish—which included Kingsessing Township—“all of the houses are timbered in the Swedish manner.”³⁷ Swedish traveler Peter Kalm recounted a March 1749 interview with ninety-one-year-old Nils Gustafson who reflected that the early Swedes:

Found no moss, or at least none which could have been serviceable in stopping up the holes or cracks in the walls. They were forced to close them, both without and within, with clay. The chimnies [*sic*] were made in a corner, either of gray sand, a stone, or... of mere clay, which they laid very thick in one corner of the house.³⁸

³²Craig, “Yocums,” 267.

³³Craig, memorandum, 2.

³⁴Andreas Rudman to Professor Jacob Arrhenius, 29 October 1697, transcribed in Craig, memorandum, and cited to the Amandus Johnson Papers, box 59, folder 1.

³⁵Jordan, 316.

³⁶As quoted in Craig, *Census*, 7.

³⁷Rudman to Arrhenius, 29 October 1697.

³⁸Peter Kalm, *Travels into North America*, vol. 1, trans. John Reinhold Forster (London, 1772),

In addition to primary sources, recent scholarship notes the usefulness of modular log construction. The functional interchangeability of simple plans—for use as houses, barns, kitchens, et cetera—and the ease of expansion by doubling and tripling units led to continued use of V-notched log structures by the Swedes and later immigrant groups.³⁹ Thus, with few exceptions, the descendants of the Swedish immigrants were most likely building predominantly in wood until after 1700 with increased contact with the English and Germans. Additionally, a historian of the Swedes in the Delaware Valley recently posited that they probably did not seriously consider masonry construction until after the dedications of Holy Trinity and Gloria Dei.⁴⁰

The improved Kingsessing farmstead that John Bartram purchased at sheriff's sale in 1728, probably did not include a stone dwelling. His standard deed for the property notes a "certain messuage or tenement" on the site when purchased for £145, but does state of what material it was constructed.⁴¹ Most, if not all, of the buildings and improvements on the property stem not from his predecessor Frederick Schaffenhause's tenure (between 1712 to about 1727) but from Mounce Jones's, Schaffenhause's brother-in-law, who lived there from about 1686 to 1704. Schaffenhause may likely have been debt ridden from the time of his purchase until his death in around 1727; indeed, it was the settlement of a debt that brought the 102-acre tract to the 1728 sheriff's sale.⁴² Jones had been living on his father's land for at least seven years prior to his formal inheritance of a 102-acre portion in 1693. In that year, Jones's acreage and improvements were valued at £40—the lowest in the township—indicating that any buildings present were quite modest (i.e. of log construction) based on comparative values.⁴³ By 1704, Jones had relocated to Manatawney and it is improbable that he had constructed a stone house on the property by the time of or after his departure.⁴⁴ As already noted, the Swedes were largely building in wood until the eighteenth century and—according to Rudman's 1697 letter—"all the houses [in his parish that included Mounce Jones's] are timbered in the Swedish manner." It seems unlikely in the intervening years that Jones would have gone through the expense and energy of constructing a stone

³⁹Jordan, 304.

⁴⁰Craig, memorandum, 9.

⁴¹Deed, Owen to Bartram, 30 September 1728.

⁴²Craig, memorandum, 14.

⁴³Ibid., 9.

⁴⁴Craig, *Census*, 38. An October 1704 letter written by Andreas Sandell, by then the pastor of Gloria Dei in Wicaco, noted that Jones's had "taken up his residence there [Manatawney]." Despite this relocation, Jones, for an undocumented reason, did not sell his Kingsessing land—indeed he purchased additional meadowland in May 1708. However, there is no additional evidence placing him on lower Schuylkill tract after 1704. See Craig, memorandum, 10–11.

house if he were contemplating a move up the Schuylkill. It was not until 1716—when Jones was flush with the profits from his Kingsessing land sale—that he constructed a stone house, still extant, in Douglassville.⁴⁵

Jones held onto his Kingsessing land until 1712, when he sold the tract to his brother-in-law for £75. The deed of sale to Schaffenhausem contained common “boiler-plate” phrasing noting that the sale included all houses, buildings, orchards, gardens, fields, fences, woods, watercourses, marsh, commons, easements, and other improvements on the property, as well as a “messuage or tenement.” This general listing of features would have only been used if the property had been improved. Thus, he was clearly purchasing a well-equipped farmstead, however there is no conclusive evidence that a stone dwelling existed on the tract then or sixteen years later when Bartram purchased the acreage. The 102 acres that John Bartram bought at sheriff’s sale included improvements—possibly in a decrepit state after Schaffenhausem’s tenure—that likely dated from Jones’s late-seventeenth- and early-eighteenth-century residency. Bartram, his young son, and, after 1729, his new wife probably resided in whatever timber structure existing on the site while their new stone house was under construction.

One glimpse of what might have been the “Mounce Jones house” in Kingsessing or at least a surviving structure from the Swedish occupancy of the tract is found in the 1758 drawing. A smaller structure standing to the house’s left and labeled “my Studey” bears some characteristics common to single-cell log houses. The exterior has a pattern of horizontal lines with a vertical line of dots along the corners that can be interpreted as representing notched log construction. Additionally, the chimney sits behind the roof’s ridgeline and—given the central location of the window on the south wall—places the chimney in the room’s southwest corner, a location common in Swedish houses. “My Studey” was probably razed, or at least moved, within the next decade as Bartram completed the new east face of the house, an expansion that included an integral study. Archaeology has failed to locate any trace of a foundation, not surprising in a structure that would have had shallow underpinnings or piers and located in a garden that has been excavated and re-graded a number of times.

If there is little chance that a masonry dwelling existed on the site when John Bartram purchased the property, when did that component of the house’s history become so ingrained in the record? A history for the John Bartram House including a stone Swedish core was probably formulated in the last decades of the nineteenth century, a topic that will be covered in the “historical context” section of this report.

⁴⁵For more information related to the Mounce Jones’s Douglassville house, see the National Register of Historic Places nomination form for the “Mouns Jones House.”

The John Bartram House: Phase I

Between his purchase of the property in 1728 and completion of the south gable wall—indicated as 1731 by a lintel date stone—Bartram constructed a commodious stone two-story house with four heated rooms, a full attic, and an entirely excavated cellar. Using the 1758 drawing, evidence drawn from the historic record and recent scholarship, and the house's extant fabric it is possible to plausibly reconstruct what Bartram built after 1728. The 1978 historic structures report was the first study to suggest that the hall-parlor unit structurally predated the kitchen unit, however, the report attributed this construction to the Swedes. Careful study of wall construction, an exterior vertical patch in the west wall between the kitchen and hall chambers, and the presence of a likely construction seam in the west wall between the kitchen and the hall foundation walls underscore that the hall-parlor unit was built first. In addition to this physical evidence, a house of this type was keeping with prevailing tendencies in domestic construction in the second quarter of the eighteenth century.

Most colonists in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries resided in single-cell dwellings with a storage or sleeping loft above. Only a minute percentage of people in English North America lived in the well-known and now-iconic mansion houses. Prior to his move from Darby to Kingessing, John Bartram probably lived in a relatively more common hall-parlor house. The 1708 inventory of his uncle Isaac's estate indicates that the house in Darby was a four-room, hall-parlor type; Bartram lived in this house for most of his young life and later inherited it from his grandmother.⁴⁶ In addition to his obvious intimacy with this type of house, in choosing to build a medium-sized and well-appointed hall-parlor house facing the Schuylkill River, John Bartram was visually expressing his prosperity in a restrained manner—perhaps on account of his Quaker upbringing. This expression manifested itself in such features as a balanced and nicely fashioned stone east front, a popular gambrel roof and pent-eaves, four heated rooms, large window openings fitted with double-hung sash, and paneled chimney breasts and doors. While making this declaration of prosperity, however, the house was the functional centerpiece of a middling Quaker's working farm and devoid of the classical organizing principles and elements that had begun to trickle into the most opulent town and country houses by this time.

Prior to purchasing the Kingessing tract, Bartram resided on the well-improved Darby farm left to him by his grandmother upon her 1723 death.⁴⁷ In addition to the land, he also inherited £100 between the estates of his father (released to him in 1720/21) and his grandmother.⁴⁸ John Bartram

⁴⁶Inventory of Isaac Bartram's Estate, 5 May 1708, 29, tss. JBBSCCL.

⁴⁷Edmund Berkeley and Dorothy Smith Berkeley, *The Life and Travels of John Bartram: From Lake Ontario to the River St. John* (Tallahassee: University Presses of Florida, 1982), 9.

⁴⁸*Ibid.*

was a man living under comfortable circumstances and prospering as well. At the time of his Kingsessing land purchase in September 1728 he was probably already acquainted with Ann Mendenhall who became his second wife in November 1729. It is possible that the impetus to purchase the land stemmed from the possibility of future marriage and leaving the deaths of his first wife and son in Darby.⁴⁹ Regardless, given that he had comparably extensive resources through inheritance, a profitable farm, and that he completed much of the construction himself, John Bartram had the means to construct a solid and well-appointed new house for his young family.

A two-story house bearing rough dimensions of 18' x 33' displayed cut stone slabs laid-up in regular courses on the river (east) front with rubble stone, probably covered in stucco, on the other three faces. The attic was contained under a gambrel roof and a pent-eave, frequently seen in early Pennsylvania houses, extended across the east face as indicated by a heavy stringcourse present in the 1758 drawing. A surviving outcropping of stone in the south gable indicates that there were probably similar eaves between the second and attic stories as well. The river front was organized in three bays with a door positioned north of center and flanked by two windows. The windows on the second story aligned with those on the first and a much larger window extended to the floor above the east door. Second-story balconies were common in the region during the first half of the eighteenth century and, given the presence of this window and the river view, it is probable that Bartram's house had one as well.⁵⁰ The openings for the first floor windows were larger than the upper windows and it appears that only these windows were fitted with shutters. All of the windows appear to be double-hung and while the exact number of panes is not discernible in all of the openings they appear to have numerous lights, possibly nine-over-nine. The lintel—still extant—above the south attic window was inscribed with the words "God Bless" in Greek, over "IOHN*ANN:BARTRAM:1731."

The interior contained two rooms on the first floor—a hall and a parlor—and two rooms and a passage on the second floor. A brick wall divided the upper and lower floors into two roughly 14' x 14' chambers, the hall and hall chamber/passage above were slightly larger and the parlor and parlor chamber slightly smaller. The northern first-floor room likely functioned as a hall. It contained two exterior doors, the stair to the upper rooms, access to the parlor, and a fireplace. Later in the century the chimney mass in the hall was reduced, however using the relieving arch dimensions and patched flooring in the second floor it is possible to surmise that a fireplace similar in size to that in the parlor existed in the space. The south jamb of the west hall window is not canted like the others in order to accommodate the

⁴⁹Berkeley, *Correspondence*, xii.

⁵⁰While very few eighteenth-century Philadelphia houses survive with their original balconies, a number of these houses have had them reconstructed based on physical evidence. For one example, see Bel Air, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, HABS PA-1124.

extruded mass of the firebox and chimney. With two exterior doors and the stair to the upper rooms, the hall was a busy circulation space. Meals were taken there and it probably was the site of varied household tasks. In many houses, the hall was also the site of food preparation, however given the relatively small size of relieving arch, it is doubtful that a fireplace large enough for cooking was part of the room. John Bartram was familiar with the concept of a detached kitchen—the Darby hall-parlor house in which he grew up likely had one.⁵¹ As previously noted, there was a dwelling and other outbuildings already on the property, and it is probable that until adding the integral kitchen, most cooking occurred in a building separate from the house, perhaps in the wood structure labeled “my Studey” in the 1758 drawing.

The parlor probably had a single entrance—from the hall—and, if similar to other hall-parlor houses in English North America, would have been the “best” room in the house. A summary of the parlor’s function in late-seventeenth-century New England hall-parlor houses is instructive in understanding a similar function at the John Bartram house.

The other ground-floor room was the parlor, in which the ‘best’ things, people, and occasions had their places. In the parlor was the best bed; along with it were the best tea table and chairs, the mirror, the tapestry table covering, and other fine-quality possessions of the household. The parlor served as the sleeping place for the heads of household, since they, like the tea table and mirror, had the most elevated status in this house. This was a world that divided space according to the meaning and value of its contents, not strictly according to the separate functions that it served.⁵²

The hall provided a buffer for the relatively isolated first-floor parlor and the upper chambers which were likely accessed by means of a once-present enclosed winder stair in the northeast corner.

The present stair is definitely a later addition as it passes in front of the now-blocked north exterior door. While no physical evidence of its actual form remains, an enclosed winder stair 5’-0” wide up to the second floor fits neatly into the hall’s northeast corner. An earlier study placed the original stair in the chimney mass between the fireboxes/flues, however, beyond the space being inconceivably small for a stair—even in eighteenth-century terms—a nearly-pointed relieving arch in the parlor closet carries the hearthstone of the parlor chamber fireplace and eliminates space for a stair. Among the evidence used placing the stair between the fireplaces is a passage in J. Hector St. John de Crèvecoeur’s *Letters from An American Farmer* (1782). The

⁵¹Inventory of Isaac Bartram’s Estate, 5 May 1708.

⁵²Elizabeth Collins Cromley, “A History of American Beds and Bedrooms,” in *Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture, IV*, ed. Thomas Carter and Bernard L. Herman (Columbia, MO: The University of Missouri Press for the Vernacular Architecture Forum, 1991), 177.

reprinted letter, supposedly written by “a Russian gentleman,” is now known to have been penned by Crèvecoeur and recounts a visit to the site taken in the mid- to late-1760s.⁵³ The passage reads:

His house is small but decent; there was something peculiar in its first appearance which seemed to distinguish it from those of his neighbours: a small tower in the middle of it not only helped to strengthen it but afforded convenient room for a staircase.⁵⁴

The earlier study took the tower reference literally as evidence that the stair ran up between the fireplaces. There are two flaws in this conclusion. First, Crèvecoeur notes that the house possessed “something peculiar in its first appearance”—a centralized chimneystack, the only exterior indication of the “tower,” would hardly have been peculiar in eighteenth-century Pennsylvania. Second, the letter was used as “phase one” evidence, however Crèvecoeur did not visit the house until near the end of the east-face aggrandizement in the 1760s. What the “Russian gentleman” described in his passage seems more likely an extruded stair tower or lobby entry and—given the other known flaws in the account—he was merely confusing two dwellings, the visit and the publication were separated by over a decade’s time.

Placing the original stair in the northeast corner simplifies the addition of the later, straighter run as the vertical opening only needed to be enlarged rather than cut anew. That the hall chamber was divided by a wood partition wall from its initial subdivision provides further evidence for a 5'-0" winder stair. The plank partition wall met the brick wall separating the hall and parlor chambers between two doors (one was eliminated in the 1920s). Both of these doors accessed the parlor and were original to the subdivision of this floor as evidenced by the manner in which the molding of the west jamb of the extant door is compressed to fit between the doorway and the now-moved partition wall. Prior to the 1926 restoration, the wall extended out from between the doors and jogged in order to accommodate the third-floor stair door. Originally, however, the wall likely extended straight across the hall chamber parallel to the east and west walls. This placement created a passage letting onto the balcony and provided access to the two second-story rooms. It stood approximately 5'-0" from the east wall, the same distance between the east wall and the jamb of the north exterior door on the first floor. Evidence of the partition wall meeting the north wall would have been lost when the present stair was configured.

⁵³Ernest Earnest, *John and William Bartram: Botanists and Explorers: 1699-1777, 1739-1823* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1940), 14.

⁵⁴J. Hector St. John de Crèvecoeur, “Letter: From Mr. Iw-n Al-z, a Russian Gentleman, Describing the Visit He Paid at My Request to Mr. John Bertram, the Celebrated Pennsylvanian Botanist,” in *Letters from an American Farmer and Sketches of Eighteenth-Century America*, London, 1782, reprint, Glouster, MA: Peter Smith, 1968), 187–188 (page citations are to the reprint edition).

The cellars under the first portion of the John Bartram House were present from the beginning—the relieving arch, integral with the parlor’s west wall and straddling both spaces—could not have been constructed without the entire cellar’s prior excavation. Despite this situation, the stonework in the two rooms under the hall and the parlor varies greatly between rooms and within the hall cellar. Large, more-or-less regularly cut and laid-up stones are present in the parlor cellar wall while the stonework in the east wall of the hall cellar appears to be of more haphazardly sized rubble stones. Excavation in December 2001 completed as part of a waterproofing project, cleared a trench along the exterior of the west foundation wall eight-feet deep.⁵⁵ The trench revealed that the relieving arch’s foundation extended further down than the adjacent foundation walls. Perhaps more interesting, an uncovered construction seam suggests that the two cellars were not constructed concurrently, but rather in two different seasons. As Bartram was directing and/or executing the work in addition to running the farm, breaks in construction were to be expected. The seam lies on the north side of the relieving arch. Given the absence of additional seams, it appears that while the relieving arch occupies nearly equal space within both cellars, its west side is structurally tied-in with the parlor cellar’s west wall. A jog in this seam suggests that the parlor cellar—and relieving arch—were constructed first. Physical evidence suggests that there may have been two bulkhead doors accessing the cellars, one in the northwest corner of the hall cellar and one in the parlor cellar’s east wall. There is no evidence that the winder stair continued down to the hall cellar.

It is impossible to know whether the attic under the gambrel roof was finished space. It contained windows indicating that it did not go unused. By the 1740s Bartram’s growing family might have needed the space for low-status (i.e. children, servant) sleeping accommodations or storage.

Paneling in Phase I

The house contains three basic generations of chimney breast and door paneling, most of which is believed to remain in their original positions, but removed and rehung during one or both of the major restorations.⁵⁶ One group is likely associated with the house’s earliest history. The panels are comparatively uncomplicated having a plain molding profile and panels raised well beyond the plane of the stiles and rails on the finished side and—in the case of the doors and shutters—also bear gently beveled backs. This dual-bevel construction indicates that the paneling was probably the work of a single joiner-cabinet maker. The doors between the hall and the parlor and

⁵⁵See field notes for photographs of the opened trench.

⁵⁶Both the 1920s and the 1980 restorations were well-documented and in the case of the earlier, all of the movement of doors has been documented. No doors were moved to new positions in 1980, however, the original early-nineteenth-century west-facing door was replaced with an interpretation of an eighteenth-century exterior door.

their respective upper chambers, one per floor, are articulated in this manner and have three panels each—a common arrangement for the second and third quarters of the eighteenth century. The closet door in the parlor and the door for the corner cupboard in the hall (moved from the pantry to its present location in the 1920s), as well as the exterior shutters on the east hall window bear this dual-beveled section.⁵⁷ Most of these hinged features are visible in the earliest, pre-restoration photographs of the house, and with the exception of the corner cupboard, believed to be in their original locations. With that said, it appears that for this early period, only the door accessing the parlor chamber remains in its original position, has its original and unchanged architrave, and hangs on its original strap hinges.

The pair of east exterior doors in the hall have five panels on each door with profiles that match the paneled sides of the east window shutters and probably date from this period as well. They are visible in the 1758 drawing and have a slightly different profile than those in the later east kitchen doors. Both sets of doors are visible in the earliest nineteenth-century photographs of the house and were not moved or replaced in the 1920s or subsequent restorations. The east-facing door and window in the hall have identical exterior architrave molding that is believed to be original. The molding is comprised of an ovolo, followed by a small cyma reversa applied to the outside of pegged frames with corner beads.

In addition to the doors and shutters, it is likely that two or three paneled chimney-breasts were completed in this construction phase. The paneled chimney back in the parlor and its integrated closet underscored the parlor's importance. The parlor chamber, with its small corner fireplace, also had a paneled chimney breast in addition to the fine room door. While it is impossible to know for certain, the hall chimney-breast may have also been paneled; the paneling on the kitchen chamber's fireplace bears a similar profile and roughly the same dimensions as the one in the parlor. It is possible that the paneling was moved to its present location when the chimney mass in the hall was cut back and a stove installed. By the 1720s, interior paneling—like the regularization of the exterior facades, double-hung windows, and numerous heated rooms—were trappings of a well-finished house. It is not surprising that Bartram's new house included paneled doors, shutters, and chimney-breasts. The restrained use of woodwork—the window jambs and lintels were not cased but merely covered in plaster—and plastered interiors denoted a degree of refinement and even stylishness while not being out-of-step with their lives as Quaker farm family. In discussing the appearance and continued life and meaning of the hall-parlor house one

⁵⁷Recent paint analysis has confirmed that a shutter on the porch window and a shutter on the west hall window contain some of the earliest paint layers surviving on the house. See Richard C. Wolbers, "Comprehensive Conservation Study for the John Bartram House, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, Vol. V, Architectural Paint Survey," 1999, JBBSCCL.

historian has commented: “in various important details the larger houses afforded more comfort and displayed signs of the occupants wealth and dignity, without being ostentatiously different” from smaller houses.⁵⁸

Unless the datestone has been moved for which there is no evidence, the first—and wholly self-contained—phase of the John Bartram House was substantially complete by 1731. As was common in eighteenth-century domestic construction, the interiors were likely finished-off later than the building shell and documentary evidence suggests that the Bartrams likely moved into an unfinished house. James Logan remarked in an August 20, 1737 letter that Bartram “wants leisure having not only his Plantation to manage but he is building himself a house most of the work of which of every kind I am told he does with his own hands.”⁵⁹ The letter alludes to an incomplete state with the house, however the language of the letter also indicates that Logan may not have visited and its state of completion would not have been fully known by him. A letter from Peter Collinson also dated 1737 suggests a more finished dwelling. He wrote to Bartram: “I have heard of thy House & thy great art & Industry in building it. it makes me long to see it & the builder.”⁶⁰

The John Bartram House: Phase II

With a growing family, Bartram added to the house—most likely in the mid-1740s—a period of lull for his North American exploration and seed- and plant-gathering trips and a time during which he had the greatest number of children living “at home.” The expansion largely involved the construction of an integral kitchen and the reconstruction and enlargement of the stair.

In 1735 and 1739, Bartram had made land transactions that greatly expanded the size of his Kingessing farm which surely required a great deal of oversight for its full cultivation. Additionally, between 1736 and 1743, Bartram was traveling almost every season on trips ranging from a few weeks to months to places as far north as Lake Ontario and as far south as Williamsburg, Virginia. On these trips he gained further knowledge of North American plants and retrieved specimens for commercial shipment to England. If he were not busy enough, it was also in the 1730s that Bartram—through the assistance and library of James Logan—began to delve into the science of botany; by 1737, he was corresponding directly with Oxford botanist John Jacob Dillenius and in 1740 was conducting his own

⁵⁸Richard L. Bushman, *The Refinement of America: Persons, Houses, Cities* (New York: Vintage Books, 1992), 108.

⁵⁹James Logan to Collinson, 20 August 1737, transcription from , Martha Crary Halpern, “Man’s Use and Love of Nature,” part II, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1990, 50, JBBSCCL.

⁶⁰Collinson to Bartram, 14 December 1737.

observations and experiments about plant reproduction.⁶¹ Needless to say, it is probable that any extensions to the house did not occur until the mid-1740s or after.

Despite his overloaded schedule, Bartram could not ignore his fast-growing family. By 1743, Bartram had eight surviving children from two marriages ranging from newborn to eighteen years of age. The great increase in family size over the decade since the initial four-room house was completed necessitated more space. As previously noted, it is probable that the kitchen for the original house was detached, and, if located in one of the structures surviving from the Swedish tenure, was likely cramped at best and deteriorating at worst. Given that the kitchen was perhaps the most important domestic production space on a working farm—housing not just cooking functions but a variety of domestic tasks—it is no surprise that an integral kitchen would have been added first. Beyond the obvious convenience of having an attached kitchen, its location would have kept Ann Bartram in close proximity of her four youngest children.

Two pieces of evidence—steps descending into the hall cellar from outside the north foundation wall and a likely construction seam located in the west wall between the “outside” of the north hall cellar wall and the shallow foundations for the west kitchen wall—indicate that the kitchen structure was appended to an existing house. It is not clear whether the pantry area was part of this original construction. As the kitchen appears now, it is impossible to imagine that there was not some sort of structure there—for example the jamb of the fireplace extends beyond the plane of the original east façade. It is important, however, to note that the east wall was definitively reworked as part of the alterations in Phase III and it is possible that the original east wall was removed and the jamb was reconstructed as part of these changes. If the kitchen included the pantry from the start, then the wall was refaced at a later time due to the south pantry wall being structurally appended to the wall defining the Phase III exterior kitchen door. Unfortunately, these questions may go wholly unanswered because the north shed obscures the construction seam and the ground below the kitchen and pantry is only partially excavated and no evidence in the foundations can be discerned.

If the original kitchen was housed in the building labeled “my Studey” in the 1758 drawing, then that space would have been freed for Bartram’s use with the construction of the integral kitchen. The view of the study includes typical Swedish construction, but also English retrofitting with a double-hung window on the south wall and a glazed and paneled door opening onto the

⁶¹Berkeley, 63–65.

garden. By the mid-1740s, Bartram's seed business transactions and interest in experimental botany surely necessitated a retreat for related work, and he may have taken over this structure at this time for this purpose.

With the addition of a large kitchen, a variety of activities that took place in the hall were probably exported as well, allowing John Bartram to reconfigure the space. It is at this time that he most likely enlarged and enhanced both the stair to the second floor as well as the attic stair, and provided interior access to the cellars. In the first known plan of the house—part of an 1854 fire insurance survey—a partition wall extending to the west exterior wall separates the straight stair entirely from the hall.⁶² The first interior photographs of the house show a reduced partition wall where the newel post and first baluster are visible and boarding is nailed to the outside of the handrail. Architectural drawings from 1921 depict a cased door facing west and located on the second step. It is impossible to discern from either the photographs or the drawings whether a full stair railing ran up behind this wall—it was either revealed or reconstructed during the 1926 restoration. It is conceivable that John Bartram constructed a closed-stringer stair open to the room—similar to the present one and only later enclosed. Over the course of the eighteenth century, larger stairs with straighter runs became more and more common even among people of more modest means.⁶³ While it is unlikely that the Bartrams were using their upper chambers at this time for even casual visits, an open stair in the hall would have conveyed that they were not ignorant of architectural fashion.

The new stair would have facilitated movement between the first and second stories with a straight run extending upward to the east with a quarter-winder at the top. Construction of the stair necessitated the closure of the former north exterior door which was turned into a closet for the kitchen. A new arched portal was cut into the wall between the hall and kitchen near its intersection with the east wall. A small passage partially filled the space of the original stair one step below the hall floor's grade and contained a door accessing a new cellar stair. This space and the kitchen beyond was closed-off from the hall by a new door. The kitchen and stair construction are believed to be concurrent because the stair almost certainly predates the addition of the kitchen chamber, believed to be part of Phase III. Prior to the 1920s reconstruction, two straight stairs from the kitchen chamber awkwardly and inconveniently met the main stair as it wound upwards to the right. If Bartram had conceived of the kitchen chamber at the time of the stair's construction, a less awkward solution would have probably been employed.

⁶²C. R. Knight, surveyor, Philadelphia Contributorship, policy No. 9119, 22 September 1854.

⁶³Bushman, 120.

The stair's construction included new attic access as well. With the winder removed and replaced by large, straighter run, the flight up to the attic had to be moved to the west. This relocation necessitated jogging the north part of the hall chamber's wood partition wall to the west.

Phase II Paneling

The molding profile for this generation of paneling is identical to the first generation, the difference between the two generations stands in their construction. The panel backs are recessed below the plane of the stiles and rails, and lack the bevel of the earlier doors. The hall-chamber, attic, and passage closet doors all belong to this generation of paneling.

John Bartram House: Phase III

By the mid-1750s, John Bartram had attained international acclaim for his knowledge of North American plant and animal species. He counted among his friends and acquaintances some of the wealthiest and most powerful men in the Pennsylvania colony. Most importantly, in the two decades that he gained renown as a botanist, John Bartram's world view steadily expanded through associations with the American Philosophical Society, which he co-founded in 1743 with Benjamin Franklin, his international correspondence, his travels throughout the colonies, and his continued self-education through books borrowed and purchased. Given Bartram's position in colonial Philadelphia, it is not surprising that he desired to transform his large farmhouse into something more akin the Georgian country houses rising along the Schuylkill River in the decades leading up to the Revolution. At a time when the his household's size was steadily decreasing as his children reached adulthood, John Bartram engaged himself with the task of enlarging and formalizing his dwelling.

John Bartram probably began the herculean effort to construct the new river front sometime around 1755. When the draught of the house was completed late in 1758, Bartram had only just begun construction. A previous interpretation of this drawing viewed the state of the north ell as a completed work, with plans for a matched single-story ell on the south.⁶⁴ Evidence cited for this argument refers to "an oval decorative cartouche" above the pantry window as indicating a finished composition. Careful examination of the drawing fails to reveal a cartouche. A dark mass of lines above the window is present, however, these appear to be the depiction of the stone courses and an overhanging tree branch rather than a cartouche. The 1758 drawing depicts a work in progress. John Bartram already raised the kitchen a full story, rebuilt the kitchen's east wall, and covered this expansion with a gambrel roof. Bartram fashioned two new doors—one on each floor—in the reconstructed east wall. A vertical "column" of stone framed these and a

⁶⁴Marsha L. Glenn, "Historic Structures Report, The John Bartram House," vol. 1, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1978, chapter iv, JBBSCCL.

large two-story opening to north that provided access to the new ell rooms. Bartram had completed the new stonework of the north ell up to the second-story sill-line. The pantry's carved window surround and exterior door were complete. A temporary roof was erected over the unfinished ell and the gaping hole in the kitchen chamber. Work had likely ceased for the season as the drawing was executed late in 1758.⁶⁵ One feature conspicuously absent from the drawing is the engaged column at the north ell's southeast corner. There are two explanations for this omission. A number of the house's components—for example the south wall's windows and the lintel date stone—are not depicted and it is possible that he chose not to represent an unfinished column. Another possibility is that the column was not yet started—the finished feature is keyed into the first-floor wall only once and the column could have been cut-in later.

The kitchen chamber construction appears to have been concurrent with the reconception of the house's east side. The most conclusive evidence supporting this timeline of construction is the hewn floor joists for the kitchen chamber which extend far into the ell and rest on a beam that is carried by the ell's walls. As already noted, in the mid-1740s a portal in the original north wall was cut through; it is believed that this opening was originally a full arch. A second, later arch opened in the same wall provided access to the kitchen chamber. Removal of this wall mass at the second floor also allowed the full arch in the kitchen to be cut back to make room for a new east-facing exterior door onto the planned portico.

While an exact date is not known, at some point in Phase II or the beginning of Phase III, the hall fireplace was cut back and likely replaced by a stove. Reducing the hall's chimney mass also provided more room in the hall chamber made smaller with the new attic stair. As constructed, the kitchen chamber contained a large fireplace with first-generation paneling on its chimney-breast. This section of paneling bears the similar dimensions to the one on the parlor chimney breast and it is possible that the woodwork was moved upstairs when the hall's chimney mass was cut back. That a stove replaced the open fireplace in the hall is evidenced by his 1772 will which refers to the space as "the ould stove room now used as a kitchen." Records show that by 1746, Bartram had copies of Benjamin Franklin's design for the semi-closed stove and it is known that in 1740–1741 Franklin's friends were testing prototypes of the new invention.⁶⁶ While undocumented, it is entirely

⁶⁵In a 6 April 1759 letter to Bartram, Collinson notes that "we are all much Entertained with thy draught of thy House and Garden." The date on the drawing is "1758" which means it was probably completed sometime towards the end of 1758, when cold weather had set in and construction had ceased for the winter.

⁶⁶Joel T. Fry, "Benjamin Franklin and the Pennsylvania Fireplace: A History and A New Example from Bartram's Garden," Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1987, revised 1991, 2, JBBSCCL.

possible that the original stove in the “ould stove room” was an early Franklin stove installed when the chimney mass was cut back late in the 1740s or early in the 1750s.

Over the next twelve years, John Bartram completed the new east façade. When compared with the initial construction campaign, the upgrades to the river front dragged on for years. Bartram made various trips up and down the east coast in the 1760s, the most notable being his exploration of the Carolinas, Georgia, and Florida in 1765–1766. Additionally, Bartram was not getting younger. He was in his late-50s when he began the new façade and even with probable assistance would still have been completing it at a less frenzied pace.

Despite the slow pace, he moved steadily forward with the changes. In 1763, Bartram remarked to Collinson that “Ye attamasco lilly is now in flower & ye spotted leaved asarum & bignonia with two leaves, it run near 30 foot up A stone pillar last year.”⁶⁷ The “stone pillar” referred to is most likely one of the portico columns, despite their real dimensions being around 18’-0” tall. It is probable that Bartram was completing work on the new façade by 1770. An inscription between the first- and second-story windows of the south ell reads “IT IS GOD ALONE ALMYTY LORD THE HOLY ONE BY ME ADOR’D JOHN BARTRAM 1770.” Furthermore, a letter from Bartram to Benjamin Franklin in 1770 forwards the idea that the interiors were near-completion as well.

Ye pamphlet & espetially ye picture of my dear Peter was very acceptable
& now I am furnished with four of our worthies Linneus, Franklin,
Edwards & Collinson (but I want Dr. Fothergill) to adorn my new stove
& lodging room which I have made very Convenient for thair reception.⁶⁸

As finished in 1770, the reconceived east façade presented a classicizing and newly dominant face to the river—expressing both John Bartram’s place in society as well as his greatly expanded knowledge of world architectural fashion. It remains difficult to pinpoint exactly where Bartram found his inspiration for the fantastical façade. An earlier study places the impetus for the recessed portico with Drayton Hall near Charleston, South Carolina.⁶⁹ He spent time in Charleston in 1760 and given that the north column was not depicted in the 1758 drawing, it is possible that this association is correct. There are differences between the two porticos as Drayton Hall’s is of wood and has two distinct open stories, while Bartram’s stone columns are two-stories high and the second floor is enclosed. There is evidence, however,

⁶⁷Bartram to Collinson, 30 May 1763.

⁶⁸Bartram to Benjamin Franklin, 24 November 1770.

⁶⁹Glenn, (17).

that supports the argument that Bartram initially conceived of two open porches contained within the portico, and only after starting construction decided to enclose the second story.

The 1758 drawing shows a door cut through from the kitchen chamber at the second story, presumably to access some sort of planned outdoor space. The enclosed porch room became a major topic during the 1920s restoration as they contemplated whether to remove the enclosure and “reopen” the space.⁷⁰ Ultimately, a decision was made to keep it enclosed because there was no evidence proving that the room was open during John Bartram’s lifetime. The 1978 historic structures report convincingly interprets the carving of the columns as evidence for Bartram’s changed plans. The northern engaged column is carved three-quarters in-the-round, the one west-facing volute is visible through the porch room’s wall—this indicates that as initially conceived, the capital would have been fully visible from the porch’s open space. Additionally, as only the east-facing sides of the other two columns were rendered, it becomes possible to surmise that sometime between the construction of the first and second columns, Bartram decided to enclose the room. This hypothesis is further proven when considering the stonework. The west porch wall was of finished stone because it was originally the east façade and the north wall was of similarly cut stone because it was constructed as an exterior wall. The south wall is of rubble stone—clearly indicating that by the time he began constructing that wall, sometime in the 1760s, he had already decided to eliminate the out-of-doors space. Thus, it appears that while John Bartram first conceived of a two-story recessed portico with open porches at both levels, sometime after he began Phase III construction Bartram decided to enclose the porch.

While the largest feature of John Bartram’s new façade, the two-story portico was visually challenged by boldly carved window surrounds on the east side of the north and south ells. These unique features loosely cite Baroque precedents which were available to Bartram in European-printed pattern books. For example, James Gibbs’s *A Book of Architecture* (1728) was generally known throughout the colonies. More particularly, by 1741 the Library Company of Philadelphia counted Isaac Ware’s 1738 translation of Andrea Palladio’s *Four Books of Architecture* among its holdings. The Ionic columns used at Palladio’s Villa Sarego in Verona—plate 49 in Ware’s edition—bear a likeness to those constructed at the John Bartram House.⁷¹

⁷⁰See 1925 “Memoranda of inspection of work of restoration in progress,” from R[alph]. L. Colton for Committee on Preservation of Historic Monuments of the Philadelphia Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, “Bartram’s House, Kingsessing, Philadelphia: Summary of Survey Preliminary to Restoration by the City of Philadelphia,” copies in JBBSC, from originals in the Horace Wells Sellers Collection, Independence National Park.

⁷¹This affinity is noted in John Cotter, Daniel G. Roberts, and Michael Parrington, *The Buried Past: An Archaeological History of Philadelphia* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1992), 277. While the exaggerated drums composing the columns of the Villa Sarego (1565) are superficially

As with most North American design appropriations from European models and books, however, Bartram would have used them as a base, altering them to suit his needs and the demands of local materials and construction. In addition to European imports, by the 1750s a number of country estates for wealthy Philadelphians dotted the countryside or were in the planning and construction stages. Given Bartram's facile movement—both geographically and socially—he undoubtedly visited some of the new houses which were organized and detailed along period classical fashion. Where most of these houses can be accurately described as conservatively staid, however, the detail on John Bartram's house is whimsical and highly personalized. Sons John and Benjamin, in their teens, and their elder brother James, living on an adjacent farm, surely assisted the aging John Bartram with the heavy labor of quarrying and cutting the stone. Interestingly, recent stone and mortar conservation work has shown that the quality of the stone, cutting, and mortar, and the care taken in laying up the walls was visibly better for the earlier stone-work, perhaps indicating less oversight or involvement by Bartram in raising the walls. He may have had his concentration fixed on the large amounts of fine carving work which required less exertion, though a great deal more precision; it was not until the 1770s that his eyesight began to seriously fail him.⁷² In the end, the carved window surrounds might be viewed as the opus of forty years of informal work as a mason. Unlike the earlier date stone bearing both his and his wife's names, the text in the panel on the south ell contains only Bartram's name, perhaps as a means to "sign" his work in addition to its devotional nature.

Over his greatly expanded house, John Bartram abandoned the earlier gambrel roof form and instead chose a simple two-plane roof fully encompassing both the earlier dwelling and its additions. A series of common rafters pegged at their apex and marked with Roman numerals for assembly purposes composed the new roof. The new space—whose expanse eventually allowed for another finished story and an attic—was so wide that its floor joists fell short of spanning from the east to the west walls and required outlookers attached on both ends to make up for this shortcoming.⁷³ Collar beams reinforced the rafter pairs just above their

similar to stone columns of the John Bartram House and John Bartram had access to Palladio's drawing of the villa, an important distinction between the buildings must also be acknowledged. The Sarego columns were purposefully articulated on designs by a well-known architect who was commissioned by a wealthy patron; they were undoubtedly cut and laid-up by skilled workers. The columns at the John Bartram House, while classically derived, were designed and hand-carved by the owner-builder. Except for the possibility of covering them with stucco, their comparatively rustic form was more likely than not a side-effect of John Bartram's technique for processing stone and conceivably unavoidable. See Isaac Ware, *The Four Books of Palladio's Architecture* (London, 1738, reprint New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1965), 2nd book, plate 49. See also 2nd book, plate 1, for the plan of the Palazzo Thiene (1542–54) in Vicenza, which has a recessed portico flanked by two small rooms, again, a possible source for Bartram's planning.

⁷²Bartram to William Bartram, 15 July 1772.

⁷³Glenn, (17).

midpoints. The attic was probably left relatively unfinished at the time as the extant room divisions likely date from the second or third decade of the nineteenth century.

Overall, very little excavation was necessary for the new east front. The north ell, like the kitchen, and the stone-floored portico remained essentially unexcavated. Only the south ell was founded on a full “new” cellar that featured well-laid stone blocks, a stone slab floor, and a new exterior bulkhead door opening to the south. A stout door closed-off this room from the parlor cellar.

It is likely that this phase of construction also included the north shed. In the beginning, it might have been a semi-open room with substantial stone walls on the east and west and a wall-less north face. Evidence linking this addition to Phase III includes a continuous drip course above the roofline that would have been difficult to key-in at a later date. This expansion northward probably also included a new brick-lined well reached by stone steps, it was centered on the expanded north wall of the house just beyond the shed.⁷⁴

The manner in which the expanded house functioned remains sketchy. Even though it might have occurred up to five years prior to the end of construction, some information can be gathered from Crèvecoeur’s published visit to the house. As already noted, his remembrances of the visit sometime in the second half of the 1760s might have become muddled between his travels and their publication, however, some of his descriptions have been verified as accurate and should be considered. Beyond the aforementioned reference to the “tower,” he makes references to three rooms in the house, one of which is probably the hall-turned-stoveroom. He noted that “we entered into a large hall where there was a long table full of victuals” where they proceeded to eat with the family and their workers.⁷⁵ If the description is accurate then this room was likely the former hall—given its relative spaciousness it could easily accommodate a “long table” and was adjacent to the kitchen. As useful as this observation stands, Crèvecoeur’s visit predated both John Bartram, Jr.’s marriage and the completion of the east-façade changes, and little more can be inferred about use of the space after the 1770 completion and the 1772 division of the house between the elder and younger Bartrams.

Crèvecoeur’s second reference does not refer to a particular room but noted his curiosity about “a distant concert of instruments.” “I followed the sound, and, by ascending the staircase, found that it was the effect of the wind through the strings of an Aeolian harp, an instrument which I had

⁷⁴*Bartram Broadside* (Summer 1998): 7, JBBSC.

⁷⁵Crèvecoeur, 189.

never before seen.”⁷⁶ In this passage he is likely referring to the kitchen chamber. The room, completed in the mid- to late-1750s, was finely finished with paneling, a chair rail, and crown molding; it might have served as a parlor-like public space while construction continued on the south end of the house. Furthermore, given its location at the top of the stairs, the melody of a wind harp would have been easily heard in the hall-turned-stoveroom. Crèvecoeur and Bartram clearly relaxed in the room while they “quaffed an honest bottle of Madeira wine.”⁷⁷ A final room notation in the publication was that after enjoying the wine, they “retired into his study.”⁷⁸ As Crèvecoeur visited sometime between 1765 and 1769, he may still be referring to the external study visible in the 1758 drawing given that a 1770 letter indicated that the new room interiors were still being furnished at that time. Although with the likelihood that the south ell’s walls were completed by the time of his visit, it is also possible that Bartram had moved his study into an enclosed but still unfinished space.

While offering commentary on how the house was divided between the older and younger Bartrams, John Bartram’s 1772 will gives little indication of the manner specific rooms functioned.

I give & bequeath to my Son John Bartram all my plantation whereon we live, situated between David Gibson’s Land & my Son James Bartram’s Land with all the Appurtenances belonging to it, both Upland & Meadows, to him & to his Heirs forever he paying his Mother yearly ten pounds & is to find her sufficient firewood cut & hauled to the Door of her Kitchen & keep her a Cow & Horse Winter & Summer on good Grass or Hay Also a sufficient spot in the Garden to sow or plant on, & full Liberty to pass & repass the Well Rooms here mentioned, that is, the new Cellar & ye two Rooms above it, ye Parlor & Chamber over it, ye ould Stove Room now used for a Kitchen, all which she must claim during her natural life as her free Right according to my Will.⁷⁹

The will does convey that he and his wife Ann were using the southern rooms of the house: the “new cellar & ye two Rooms above it” (study and study chamber); “ye Parlor and Chamber over it” (parlor and parlor chamber); and “ye ould Stove Room now used for a Kitchen” (probably the hall-turned-stove room).

John Bartram’s 1779 estate inventory—providing only the contents of the southern rooms—gives an idea of how they were used. The study contained—among other items—a great deal of plate and paper money, a

⁷⁶Ibid., 191.

⁷⁷Ibid.

⁷⁸Ibid.

⁷⁹Last Will and Testament of John Bartram, 17 January 1772.

twenty-four hour clock, a desk, a small stove and “funnel,” and a bedstead and bedding.⁸⁰ These items acknowledge that the room probably still functioned as John Bartram’s “office” of sorts as well as being a possible retiring space for visitors. This room may also have been Bartram’s “new stove & lodging room” as noted in the aforementioned 1770 letter to Benjamin Franklin. An earlier history argued that the “new stove & lodging room” in question was actually the kitchen chamber and the adjacent north ell room.⁸¹ There is no evidence, however, that the fireplace in that space was ever fitted with a stove. Furthermore, in the 1779 inventory, Bartram’s estate included “1 Small Close Iron Stove & Funell” which has been described as a closed six-plate stove with a stovepipe which became more popular among Pennsylvania’s English colonists after 1760.⁸² As Bartram and his wife were residing in the southern rooms by 1772, it seems likely that “my new stove & lodging room” was among these rooms and quite possibly was the first-floor study.⁸³

According to the inventory, the parlor contained no bedding whatsoever and was filled with a variety of objects for domestic production as well as luxury items evoking a genteel life. These items included: a “close” press, couch, arm chair, spice drawers, pewter dishes, spinning “whel,” a looking glass with sconces, “floore” cloth, knives, forks, and one Delft bowl and dish. While not ostentatious, this room was furnished comfortably and served a variety of functions. The study chamber appears to have been lightly, but well-furnished with a bed and bedding, a looking glass, and two leather-bottomed chairs; there were no fire implements present indicating the room—without a fireplace—had no stove. The parlor chamber does not appear to have been used on a daily basis, despite its size, finish, and fireplace. Inventoried are an “old” bedstead and bedding, “old low draws” and a chest, “one set of globes broke,” a “library” valued at £1000, a kettle and small iron pot. The contents indicate that the room might have been a storage space for Bartram’s books and other items no longer or infrequently in use.

Because they were not formally used by John Bartram, the house’s other rooms were not inventoried and only a bit of evidence exists as to how they were used. As noted in the will, the hall-turned-stoveroom was used by Bartram and his wife, however it was probably also a flexible mediating space between the elderly Bartrams and their son John and his young family. As observed by Crèvecoeur late in the 1760s, it is plausible that the room continued to be used for meals give the proximity of the large kitchen.

⁸⁰Inventory of John Bartram Estate, 18 September 1779.

⁸¹Glenn, fig. 20b.

⁸²Fry, “Benjamin...,” 58.

⁸³Ibid.

On account of his failing eyesight, Bartram turned over the day-to-day business of the farm to his son John in 1771.⁸⁴ John married Elizah Howell in that year as well and had her first child (only three survived) two years later; John's sister Elizabeth married in the same year and another brother Benjamin wed in 1773. The changes in the household when coupled with the sporadic reappearances and disappearances of William Bartram throughout the 1770s meant that the remaining rooms to the north would have had changing functions during the period. The younger Bartrams used the integral kitchen as their own and possibly the hall-turned-stoveroom as a dining space. The kitchen chamber above was divided into two rooms—possibly a parlor-like room with a fireplace and a sleeping chamber on the east. John and his family also had use of the chamber above the old hall and the porch chamber. The well-finished porch room and its prominent location—facing southeast and overlooking the “common flower garden”—might indicate that it was used by William Bartram when he was “at home.”

The third floor/attic—floored and possibly whitewashed but otherwise unfinished—probably was low-status “overflow” sleeping and storage space.⁸⁵

Phase III Paneling

As with the earlier construction phases, Bartram had portions of his new rooms paneled and commissioned paneled doors. Two new doors—opening onto the study and the porch chamber—contained four equal-sized rectangular panels arranged two-over-two. The molding profile was slightly more delicate than the earlier paneling with quarter-round molding rising from the bevel instead of a merely a raised panel. The back was plainly articulated. This type of molding profile is also present in the paneling on the south wall and closet doors of the porch chamber, and the glass cabinet doors in the kitchen chamber and in the study chamber. Compared with the earlier construction, the number of paneled walls was reduced, however other decorative features appeared in the house for the first time. An elaborate cornice composed of a large cyma recta followed by a small cyma reversa extended along the top of the kitchen chamber's north wall, as well as on both sides of the beam between this chamber and the room in the north ell. Both the kitchen and the porch chambers had chair rails aligned with the window sills. In the kitchen chamber, this feature extended along part of the west and north walls, and in the porch chamber, along the east and west walls.

⁸⁴Bartram to Franklin, 29 April 1771.

⁸⁵Traces of whitewash are present on the upper portions of the rafters visible from the small present attic. This whitewash may have only been used after the third-floor was finished—the attic space would have been seen by people using the roof platform—or it may be residue from the period before the third-floor was finished.

7. Alterations and additions:

The second manifestation of John Bartram's house was completed around 1770. He saw his comfortable two-and-one-half story gambrel-roofed dwelling—solidly built, but simply articulated in the local vernacular—expand to become an impressive “homegrown” classical showpiece on the Schuylkill River. After his death in 1777, the house and farm passed to John Bartram, Jr. As the dwelling was quite large and well-finished and John, Jr.'s family was comparatively small on account of the 1784 death of his wife, it is unlikely that he pushed any major changes. A resurvey for the 1798 Federal Direct Tax notes the dimensions of the house independent of the shed additions. This use of dimensions does not necessarily eliminate their existence at that time, however, as the recordation process was generally not flawless and the taxable house was essentially the two-story central portion.⁸⁶ It is possible that the shed additions were ignored when considering the

taxable additions and, as previously noted, the northern shed may have existed since Phase III of the John Bartram construction; the southern shed, or conservatory, more definitively dates to the later Carr residency.

The John Bartram House: Phase IV and After

John Bartram, Jr.'s daughter Mary wed Nathan Jones in 1794 and moved from the house; the estate farm operations were turned-over to Jones in 1799.⁸⁷ Son James became a doctor and resided in Kingsessing Township. Daughter Ann remained at the family home, caring for her father and aging uncle William with apparently only the assistance of domestic servant Flora Iris, resident in the household from around 1798 to 1813.⁸⁸ On March 4, 1809, Ann married Robert Carr who held some wealth as owner of a printing business.⁸⁹ After their marriage, the Carrs took over the day-to-day running of both the household and the farm activities—and, perhaps as a statement of the younger generation's ascendancy and the relative wealth introduced by Carr, made changes to the house. Paint analysis revealed early-nineteenth-century decorative painting in what had been John Bartram's study and the report surmised that there were probably similar finishes in other rooms, these finishes are attributed to the Carrs.⁹⁰

⁸⁶Federal Direct Tax of 1798, 1st div., 4th assessment district, R. Tettermay, assessor, 11 July 1800, tss. JBBSCCL.

⁸⁷Fry, “Phase I...,” 128.

⁸⁸Merril D. Smith, “The Bartram Women: Farm Wives, Artists, Botanists, and Entrepreneurs,” *Bartram Broadside* (Winter 2001): 11, endnote 59.

⁸⁹Martha Cray Halpern, “Man's Use and Love of Nature,” part III, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1990, 77, JBBSCCL. Robert Carr learned the printing trade under Benjamin Franklin's grandson Benjamin Franklin Bache. Carr concentrated his printing business in high-end publications like scientific volumes and academic texts. See Fry, “Phase I...,” 132.

⁹⁰Wolbers, “Architectural Paint Survey.”

A more intriguing question pertains to when the Carrs began to divide the immense attic into a full third floor and smaller attic. A notation in Nathan Jones's accounts for John Bartram, Jr. indicates that 350 feet of "boards for garret" was ordered on March 25, 1809, three weeks after Robert and Ann's marriage.⁹¹ While 350 board feet is only roughly half of the amount needed to partition the third-floor rooms, it is possible that the Carrs began the process of finishing the third floor with the dormers, which were necessary for the later room divisions. In planning and constructing the dormers, the undocumented builder employed symmetrical architraves and corner-blocks on their exteriors. While these motifs are generally associated with the appearance of Greek Revival design in the United States, there are some earlier high-style examples.⁹² Most of the earliest surviving American examples of symmetrical architraves with corner blocks date from the first- and second- decades of the nineteenth century—for example Decatur House (1809) by Benjamin Henry Latrobe and Tudor Place (1816) by William Thornton, both located in Washington, D.C.⁹³ However, in cosmopolitan Philadelphia, their pairing might have occurred late in the eighteenth century at William Hamilton's house, The Woodlands, a landmark of neoclassical domestic planning and Adamesque decoration in America.

At The Woodlands, three arched doorways open onto the river-facing portico from the "saloon." Each of the doorways is detailed with symmetrical architraves surmounted by corner blocks located at the springing point of the arches. A ca. 1792 painting depicts the outer shell of the expanded house completed; the arched openings are clearly visible, unfortunately the drawing is not detailed enough to know if the molding was in place.⁹⁴ As late as 1806, a visitor commented that the saloon was not yet finished.⁹⁵ It is likely, however, that the exterior would have been considered for completion first and a ca. 1809 view of the house clearly shows the doors and fanlights executed and the trim would have likely been fashioned along with the other details.⁹⁶ Thus, the pairing of symmetrical architraves with corner blocks possibly occurs significantly earlier at The Woodlands than elsewhere, not surprising when considering the overall expansion and many of its details were worked out in England in consultation with an unknown English architect. Even at the later ca. 1809 date, this sort of design would still have been "cutting-edge" in the United States.

⁹¹"Bartram, John [Jr.] Estate, Nathan Jones's Accounts," copies in JBBSCS.

⁹²Orlando Rideout, Chief, Office of Research, Survey & Registration, Maryland Historical Trust, to author, electronic correspondence, 9 August 2001.

⁹³Ibid.

⁹⁴J. P. Malcom, "Woodlands, the seat of W. Hamilton Esqr," ca. 1792, Dietrich American Collection, as reproduced in: Timothy P. Long, "The Woodlands: A 'Matchless Place,'" thesis, University of Pennsylvania, 1991, 364.

⁹⁵Personal interview, Timothy P. Long, 8 November 2001.

⁹⁶William Strickland, "The Woodlands," ca. 1809, as reproduced in: Long, 330.

When considering the John Bartram House dormers, even if they were not designed by a high-style professional (which is probably the case), they could still bear a date around 1809. William Bartram and William Hamilton were neighbors on the west bank of the Schuylkill River and both held an intense interest in botany and horticulture; the Woodlands estate boasted a large greenhouse flanked by two hothouses. Given their geographic proximity and mutual interests, William Bartram was probably familiar with the up-to-date exterior decoration visible at Woodlands and could have directed the dormer fabricator to use the motifs in the expansion of his lifelong permanent residence. Correspondingly, the finished dormers maintain a delicacy common to Federal architectural elements rather than exhibiting the boldness of Greek molding profiles, which would suggest a later date. With the exception of the third-floor casements and the south window of the study, all of the window openings in the house proper received new double-hung sash when the dormers were constructed.

Changes to the house slowed with the coming of war and the death of John Bartram, Jr. Strained family relations brought about by Nathan Jones's mismanagement of the farm led to a labyrinthine process of dividing the estate after his 1812 death.⁹⁷ Despite this legal morass, Robert and Ann Carr took legal possession of the thirty-two acres which included the mansion in December 1814.⁹⁸ Robert Carr's printing business was bankrupted by the War of 1812 and they attempted to regain solvency with the commercial nursery.

The ruin of my business during the late war and subsequent losses in disposal of my stock of materials deprived me of the fruit of twelve years of successful industry and induced me to engage in a new avocation wherein the cultivation of my wife's parental estate I hoped at least to secure a decent livelihood, but...I find my situation being far from enviable as from current estimates of the last three years, I find my net income will not meet my expenses.⁹⁹

Carr goes on to note that he would be in favor of selling the land if it were not for the attachment of "our Uncle William Bartram" to the garden. Despite the gloomy outlook on their circumstances and William Bartram's death in 1823, Robert and Ann Carr held onto the property and, it seems, for a time turned a healthy profit in the commercial nursery business.¹⁰⁰ A growing business may have prompted the Carrs to add the conservatory to the south end of the house. The Carrs may have also been responsible for the construction of a large roof platform accessed by a roof hatch. It is possible that a viewing platform was part of the 1770s roof construction,

⁹⁷Fry, "Phase I...", 133-134.

⁹⁸Kenyon, et al, 10, from Deed of Partition, Ann Bartram Carr and James Bartram to Mary Jones, 3 December 1814.

⁹⁹As quoted in Halpern, part III, 77.

¹⁰⁰Fry, "Phase I...", 136-138.

however, the observation deck—with a “plain fancy railing”—depicted in an 1849 view in William Darlington’s *Memorials of John Bartram and Humphry Marshall* is more likely a nineteenth-century construction given its complex, Chippendale-esque handrail.¹⁰¹

As indicated by the 1820 census schedule, the Bartram-Carr household was growing for the first time in decades with Robert and Ann Bartram Carr, William Bartram, and John Bartram Carr (Robert’s son by his first wife), as well as an unidentified “free white female” over forty-five years of age—possibly a live-in housekeeper or cook—all listed in the household. Additionally, there were five free people of color included—a male and female between 26 and 45, one male between 14 and 26, and a male and female under 14. While it is possible that these people—by ages likely a nuclear family—lived elsewhere on the property, the third floor may have provided accommodations for them in the John Bartram House. As already noted, the third-floor dormers were likely constructed early in the Carr marriage (ca. 1809), however, a decade of financial uncertainty and a shrinking household may have cooled an urge to partition and finish the third-floor rooms. The revived commercial nursery would have provided the need for workers, their lodging, and the capital to complete the third-floor rooms.

Other alterations to the dwelling also support it having housed two distinct families. Some earlier histories place the cutting of the west exterior door and the adjacent kitchen opening as part of the Eastwick residency, it is far more likely that these changes were contemporary with the Carr occupancy. The Eastwicks lived in the house for about a year while their new house was being built to the south and it is doubtful that they would have engaged in major retrofitting—notably cutting two doors through eighteen-inch stone walls—during that time. The aforementioned December 2001 excavation revealed that great care was taken in cutting the new exterior door, a narrow, but wall-width threshold stone was inserted into the foundation wall. An 1854 fire insurance diagram of the John Bartram house’s first floor shows a partition wall completely separating the staircase from the former hall; evidence of the partition’s full extension to the west wall was visible in the ceiling prior to the 1980 restoration.¹⁰² By fully separating the stair and cutting new exterior and interior doors, the Carrs created a circulation pattern that allowed access between the modest third-floor rooms and the kitchen (via the circulation passage on the second-floor) without passing through any of the other rooms in the house. It is improbable that they would have gone through the trouble of cutting another kitchen door from the hall-stoveroom area into the kitchen for their own purposes. In addition to its logical function with the new openings, stair partition, and third-floor

¹⁰¹Knight, Philadelphia Contributorship.

¹⁰²Knight, Philadelphia Contributorship.

rooms, the west door bore an arrangement of panels reflective of popular local design prior to mid-century. Thus, it is probable that during a period of relative solvency in the 1820s, Robert and Ann Bartram Carr had an African-American family living on the third-floor of the house and made changes to the dwelling necessary for maintaining period notions regarding race, domesticity, family and privacy.

Another minor nineteenth-century change is probably attributable to the Carrs, however, it may date from the Eastwick tenure. The third-floor casement windows in the north gable were changed from rectangular heads to pointed-arches. A Carr-period change with these windows would not be surprising given that they were fully utilizing the outbuildings to the north for their business activities.

On account of the decline of the plant business and mounting debts, the Carrs sold the property to Andrew Eastwick in 1850. Eastwick and his family lived in the John Bartram House prior to the completion of their new house—Bartram Hall—which was designed by Samuel Sloan. After Bartram Hall was finished, the Eastwicks used the house for a variety of purposes and, according to family history, at least two of Andrew Eastwick's sons lived in the dwelling at various times.

A few years later John Bartram's old house was once again occupied by an Eastwick, this time my grandfather, Joseph Harrison Eastwick, upon his marriage to Catherine Trimble, a Quaker. It was there, too, that my father Abram Eastwick, son of Joseph, spent a part of his Youth.¹⁰³

We [the Charles J. Eastwick family] returned to Philadelphia in 1879 and went to live in the old John Bartram House on my grandfather Eastwick's [Andrew M. Eastwick] place.¹⁰⁴

With the possible exception of the latticed west porch and the studding-out of the hall and parlor walls, and some new room floors, there appears to have been no notable changes to the house during the period of Eastwick ownership. Despite its age when purchased by the City of Philadelphia, a majority of the historic fabric remained intact—original to each period of construction and/or alteration.

Since that time, the house has gone through two major restorations completed in 1926 and 1980, and experienced the wear and repair of frequent use. The 1920s restoration removed the studded-out hall and parlor

¹⁰³Eastwick, "Speech." Joseph Harrison Eastwick and Catherine Trimble were married 13 October 1858 in West Chester, Pennsylvania. If the reminiscences of J. H. Eastwick's grandson are accurate, the newlyweds moved into the John Bartram house. Marriage date obtained via email from Charles Whiting, the great-great-great grandson of Andrew M. Eastwick, 13 October 2001.

¹⁰⁴Whiting (Eastwick).

walls and the partition around the stairs; created the present partition walls in the kitchen; exposed the hewn kitchen-chamber floor joists below; opened-up closed or reduced fireplaces in the hall and kitchen chamber; reconstructed the stair juncture at the entrance to the kitchen chamber; altered the room division between the kitchen chamber and the adjacent room in the north ell; relocated the partition wall between the hall chamber and second-story passage; and lathed and plastered the middle room on the west side of the third floor.¹⁰⁵ Generally, the 1920s restoration repaired, replastered, and repainted the house where needed—interior and exterior—and replaced the boarding in some of the rooms. It was also at this time that limited heating was introduced with vents in the first floor rooms; the first electrical hook-ups may date from this period as well. The reconstruction of the roof platform depicted in William Darlington's 1849 collection of John Bartram's correspondence was planned, but ultimately unexecuted.¹⁰⁶

The 1980 restoration expanded heating and air conditioning on all floors; rebuilt and rehabilitated the window sash; introduced steel supports and beams in various places throughout the house; created a number of "viewing boxes" exposing construction methods; and generally refurbished parts of the house that needed plaster, paint, or repair.¹⁰⁷

B. Historical Context

Bartram's Garden and the Business of Plants and Seeds

John Bartram was born to William Bartram and Elizah Hunt Bartram in Darby, Pennsylvania on May 23, 1699, the grandchild of some of the colony's first Quaker settlers. Bartram's mother died early in his life and his father left John under the care of his grandmother when he left to settle land in North Carolina, where he was later killed in an Indian attack. On account of Quaker dedication to child education, Bartram learned basic reading and writing skills at a local school in Darby.¹⁰⁸

Bartram spent his childhood on his grandmother and uncle Isaac's well-improved holdings and it was during this time that he learned the skills necessary to run a farm. In 1723, his grandmother died and this family farm in Darby passed to him. In addition to the land, he also inherited £100 between the estates of his father (released to him in 1720/21) and his grandmother.¹⁰⁹ John Bartram was a man living under comfortable circumstances and prospering as well when he married Mary

¹⁰⁵ A listing of work completed on the house for the 1920s restoration is documented on drawings housed at the Athenaeum of Philadelphia and in R. L. Colton for Committee on Preservation of Historic Monuments of the Philadelphia Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, "Bartram's House, Kingessing, Philadelphia: Summary of Survey Preliminary to Restoration by the City of Philadelphia."

¹⁰⁶ As depicted in architectural drawings related to the 1920s restoration work and housed at the Athenaeum of Philadelphia.

¹⁰⁷ See architectural drawings related to the 1980 restoration housed at JBBSC.

¹⁰⁸ Berkeley, 4–5.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., 9.

Maris in 1723. Two boys, Richard and Isaac, were born prior to his wife's death in 1727; Richard died soon afterward. As death was not an alien feature of eighteenth-century life and Bartram had a young son to care for, he married Ann Mendenhall in November 1729 and settled on the recently purchased land in Kingessing township where he commenced construction for a substantial house and planting what would become a very prosperous farm. He fertilized soil and rotated crops with such precision that he had returns on hay, flax, oats, and corn from one-third to one-half greater than his contemporaries; with similar ingenuity, Bartram turned swampy bottomlands into grazing pasture for livestock.¹¹⁰ Bartram expanded his Kingessing holdings twice in 1735 and 1739 and established himself as a dominant landholder on the west bank of the Schuylkill River.

Concurrent with earning a living through land cultivation, he was also creating a solid foundation of knowledge regarding North American plant species and botanical sciences that would both augment his earnings as well as bring him world renown. In 1733, Bartram and Peter Collinson were introduced through transatlantic business contacts; they ultimately became lifelong friends and corresponded frequently. Collinson busied himself with colonial trade and held an immense interest in gardening and exotic plants.¹¹¹ Through Bartram, Collinson gained direct access to North American plant species and ultimately became Bartram's European contact for other interested plant fanatics. At first, compensation for shipments was informal. Collinson wrote in 1734/35:

I am very sensible of the great pains & many Tiresome Trips to Collect so many Rare plants scattered att a distance. I shall not forget It: but in some measure to show my Gratitude, tho' not In proportion to thy Trouble I have sent thee a small token a Callico gown for thy wife & some odd Little things that may be of use amongst the Children.¹¹²

Ultimately, more regular schedules of payment were worked out based on the number of boxes sent, however Bartram often complained that the monies received were never enough.¹¹³ Collinson controlled Bartram's English accounts and was the filter through which Bartram's requests for goods from fabric to books to specie passed.¹¹⁴ While they were friends, it seemed Collinson felt that Bartram benefited from his advice on all matters beyond the realm of North American plants. For example, in preparation for a trip to Virginia, Collinson advised:

¹¹⁰Earnest, 12.

¹¹¹Berkeley, 18–19.

¹¹²Bartram to Collinson, 24 January 1734/35.

¹¹³Halpern, part III, 42–43, for standardized payment; Berkeley, 48, for complaint. Given the problems with transferring specie in the eighteenth-century transatlantic world, Bartram's payment often continued to be in goods, but "bills of exchange" were also negotiated between Philadelphia and London commercial establishments. Joel T. Fry, Curator of Historic Collections, Historic Bartram's Garden, to author, electronic correspondence, 23 October 2001.

¹¹⁴Berkeley, 48.

One thing I must Desire of thee and do Insist that thee oblige Mee therein that thou make up that Druggett Clothes, to go to Virginia In and not appear to Disgrace thyself or Mee for tho I would not Esteem thee the less to come to Mee in what Dress thou Will, yet these Virginians are a very gentle, Well Dress'd people, & look phaps More at a Man's Outside than his Inside, for these and other Reasons pray go very Clean, neat & handsomely Dressed to Virginia.¹¹⁵

Despite the occasional unwarranted advice, however, the two remained close friends by means of letter as well as business partners in the increasingly lucrative seed and plant trade. Under Collinson's and other clients' encouragement and his own *wanderlust*, Bartram made trips throughout the North American colonies that greatly expanded his geographical and botanical knowledge of the continent. In addition to collecting and seed and plant sales, Bartram used his associations with men like James Logan and Benjamin Franklin—and their libraries—to further his knowledge of scientific botany. Over time, Bartram became a respected member of the international scientific and intellectual community, ultimately co-founding the American Philosophical Society with Benjamin Franklin in 1743 and being named the “King’s Botanist” in 1765.

I have the pleasure to Inform my Good Friend that my Repeated Solicitations have not been in Vain for this Day I received certain Intelligence from our Gracious King that He had appointed thee His Botanist with a salary of Fifty pounds a Year & in pursuance thereof I received they first half years payment of thy Salary, Being Twenty five pounds to Lady Day last—which I have carried to thy Account.¹¹⁶

While mainly responsible for sending acquired seeds to King George III, this new position required Bartram to embark on his most famous journey into the Carolinas, Georgia, and Florida in 1765–1766.¹¹⁷ Not surprisingly, his duties and his compensation ended with the outbreak of the Revolution.

Like many of his intellectual counterparts in Philadelphia, Bartram's scientific activities ran beyond a casual hobby. In addition to employing his knowledge of botany to a financial means, nature and its order—for Bartram and others—was integral with the “sovereignty of God.”¹¹⁸ Bartram was raised in the Quaker tradition, however, his Christian-based but thoroughly Enlightened views linking God, nature and science, and virtuous living did not necessarily co-exist with religious doctrine related to the divinity of Jesus Christ.¹¹⁹ His rejection of this doctrine ultimately led to disownment by the Society of Friends Darby Monthly Meeting in 1757–1758, though he continued to attend services with his family

¹¹⁵Collinson to Bartram, 17 February 1737/38.

¹¹⁶Collinson to Bartram, 9 April 1765.

¹¹⁷Earnest, 80.

¹¹⁸Harold E. Taussig, “Deism in Philadelphia during the Age of Franklin,” *Pennsylvania History* 37:3 (1970): 223.

¹¹⁹*Ibid.*, 230–231.

throughout the remainder of his life. The action clearly did not greatly affect his friendships and business relationships, rather the chronicled proceedings indicate a consistency in the structure of Bartram's world view.¹²⁰

By the end of his life, a trip to Bartram's botanical garden was a necessary stop on any visit to Philadelphia. Even after John Bartram's death in 1777, the reputation of the Bartram family as "plant men" continued and was energized by activities surrounding Philadelphia and the founding of the United States. George Washington commended the Bartrams for their "many curious plants, shrubs and trees, many of which are exotics" but was disappointed with the perceived haphazard layout of the Bartram's scientific and personalized garden; he complained that it "was not laid off with much taste nor was it large."¹²¹ Thomas Jefferson noted in 1797 the skill that John Bartram, Jr. took in selecting, propagating, and shipping plant species as well as their moderate prices.¹²² By this time, John Bartram, Jr. had been at the helm of the family plant business—a relatively expansive commercial venture—essentially since his father's departure for the Carolinas, Georgia, and Florida in 1765 and Bartram, Sr. showed considerable respect for his abilities.¹²³ The disruption of the Revolution eliminated English trade for the time being and, while they continued to conduct business with European clients until the 1840s, interest in the domestic market increased. In 1799, John Bartram, Jr. concerned himself with the plant business entirely as he turned farm operations over to his son-in-law Nathan Jones.¹²⁴

In managing the plant business, John Bartram, Jr. received assistance from his by then internationally-famous intellectual brother William. William Bartram's fame stemmed from his seminal work—*Travels Through North and South Carolina, Georgia, East and West Florida, the Cherokee Country, the Extensive Territories of the Muscogulees, or Creek Confederacy, and the Country of the Chactaws* (1791)—which, not surprisingly, chronicled his observations while traveling throughout the southeast between March 1773 and January 1777. Born at Bartram's Garden in 1739 with a twin sister, Elizabeth, it soon became evident that William Bartram was as interested in the natural world as his father and had a knack for drawing as well. During his childhood, he occasionally accompanied his father on travels throughout the east. In 1752, at the age of thirteen, John Bartram enrolled William in the Philadelphia Academy (antecedent to the University of Pennsylvania) where he studied until the Winter 1756 term, before entering into an apprenticeship with a merchant.¹²⁵ While no degrees were conferred at this time, William had obtained one of the highest levels of education available in colonial America. Despite this situation, Bartram

¹²⁰"The Religious Views of John Bartram, the Great Botanist, and His Disownment by Darby Monthly Meeting of Friends, in 1758," August 1915, mss. Historical Society of Pennsylvania, B294r 1915.

¹²¹As quoted in Earnest, 162-163.

¹²²*Ibid.*, 162.

¹²³Halpern, part III, 62.

¹²⁴Fry, "Phase I...", 128.

¹²⁵See William Daniel Cahill, "William Bartram and the Romance of Learning: A Study in Eighteenth-Century American Education," Diss. Rutgers University, 2001.

encouraged his son to pursue a practical apprenticeship, rather than botany and natural science. His reasons for this direction were made clear in a 1755 letter to Collinson.

My son William is just turned of sixteen it is now time to propose some way for him to get his living by. I dont want him to be what is commonly called A gentleman...I want to put him to some business by which he may with care & industry get A temperate reasonable living...I am afraid Botany & drawing will not afford him one & hard labour does not agree with him.¹²⁶

Despite Bartram's worries about and best efforts to avoid having his son become "what is commonly called a gentleman," that is arguably what came of William Bartram. Between the end of his apprenticeship in 1761 and the beginning of his travels in the southeast in 1774, Bartram variously attempted to manage a store in Cape Fear, North Carolina, accompanied his father on his most extensive trip to the Carolinas, Georgia, and Florida in 1765-1766, and established an indigo plantation on the St. John River in Florida. He apparently had little success in these endeavors and relied on support from the elder Bartram, who by 1772 seemed ready to cut "Billy" off.

Dear Billy, I wrote last week but am afraid it miscarried so I now write a few lines lest ye other mist... we are surprised at thy wild notion of going to Augustine... indeed I dont intend to have any more of my estate spent there or to ye southward and upon any pretense whatsoever I think it is much better for thee to come home and dwell amongst thy relatives & friends who I doubt not will endeavor to put thee in A way of profitable business if thee will take their advice & be industrious and carefull... My eye sight is gone very dim & I have thrown of all plantation business to John & we live with him.¹²⁷

William did return home for a short time prior to his extensive travels, but he did not relocate permanently to Philadelphia until early in 1777, less than a year prior to his father's passing. William Bartram spent the next forty-six years at Bartram's Garden during which time he authored *Travels* and other less extensive works, and continued plant cultivation for business and pleasure. He never held legal ownership of the family lands nor was he included in his brother John's will; he was listed in Kingsessing tax records as a "botanist," but showed virtually no personal wealth.¹²⁸ Despite these official realities, Bartram remained the public face of the family and the plant business. Through an open-door policy at the garden and correspondence, he also significantly influenced an entire generation of young natural scientists including: Benjamin Smith Barton, Thomas Nuttall, and Alexander Wilson, among others.¹²⁹ William Bartram died in 1823, reportedly under a tree in the garden he had known for the entirety of his life.¹³⁰

¹²⁶Bartram to Collinson, 27 April 1755.

¹²⁷Bartram to William Bartram, 15 July 1772.

¹²⁸Fry, "Phase I...", 128.

¹²⁹Joel T. Fry, Curator of Historic Collections, Historic Bartram's Garden, to author, electronic correspondence, 4 December 2001.

¹³⁰Slaughter, 3.

Nine years earlier, the estate—jointly held by Mary, James, and Ann since their father's 1812 death—was formally partitioned between the members of the third generation of Bartrams to live on the west bank of the Schuylkill River. Robert and Ann Bartram Carr received the thirty-two acres containing the Bartram house and all of the associated nursery buildings, Ann being a botanist, naturalist, and artist of note in her own right. Under the guidance of their uncle William, Robert and Ann continued to learn about and expand the nursery business. This good fortune continued for about a decade after William Bartram's death, until financial difficulties brought on by the Panic of 1837 and increased competition from other nurseries forced them to sell Bartram's Garden in 1850. The activities surrounding the site after Eastwick's purchase were no longer tied-up with a plant business, but rather with the history and nostalgia appended to the site beginning with Andrew Eastwick.

Bartram's Garden and the Business of History and Nostalgia

For its first century, Bartram's Garden was known and visited on account of its array of plants—both for purchase as well as pleasure. With the sale of the land including the house, greenhouses, and garden in 1850, commercial interest in the grounds fell off. This change, however, did not eliminate horticultural fascination with the place; additionally, overall concern with the site expanded at this time to include people seeking out America's "roots," first with the Eastwicks, but particularly in the wake of the 1876 Centennial Exposition held in West Fairmount Park. The site became a shrine to a member of the pantheon of early important Philadelphians and a direct link to what was viewed as a simpler and nobler age. The site's associational value drove campaigns to preserve what remained in the garden and the "manor house" in addition to providing urban population with greenspace.

Upon Andrew Eastwick's purchase of the Carr-Bartram tract, he turned to the task not only of constructing a new "villa"—honorifically named "Bartram Hall"—but also maintaining the old house and the grounds. The west bank of the Schuylkill River remained a popular place to "rusticate," particularly after Eastwick constructed a lake in the bottomlands southeast of his house.¹³¹ During his tenure, Eastwick informally opened the grounds to visitors and, at least in popular legend, kept the story of John Bartram alive. Perhaps his most important contribution to the site's survival was his hiring of gardener Thomas Meehan to care for the historic grounds between 1850 and 1852.¹³² While only at the site for a short period of time, Meehan ultimately included "Bartram Park" in his agenda for the establishment of small public parks in the 1880s. Elected a member of the City of Philadelphia Common Council in 1882, Meehan—by then a local leader in horticultural activities—turned his energies to found a City Parks Association.¹³³ By 1888, Meehan's efforts were successful as Mayor Edwin Fitler approved an ordinance setting aside lands for public parks that included Bartram's Garden; an ordinance one year later appropriated

¹³¹Halpern, part III, 116–117.

¹³²Ibid., 120–122.

¹³³Ibid., 122.

monies for the purpose.¹³⁴ While the City Parks Movement in the United States propelled the City of Philadelphia to purchase the grounds and house, it was not merely the addition of green-space that fully drove interest in the acreage and surviving house, but also the awakening of interest in American history.

In the aftermath of the 1876 Centennial Exposition in Philadelphia, the United States was gripped with an intense attraction to its colonial roots. This attraction was fueled in part through reaction to the rapid industrialization and immigration, drastically changing both rural and urban landscapes. More importantly in the case of Bartram's Garden, however, the emergence of an "American history" stemmed from a drive to establish an "American canon" of places and heroes and to legitimize the country's place in the world order. For Bartram descendants—who in 1884 began informally meeting in regard to the state of their ancestral home—and other Philadelphians, John and William Bartram, and their botanical garden and colonial travels were integral to a rich historical past.¹³⁵ With the opening of a public park in 1891, the grounds and house became a shrine of sorts to honor the contributions of the Bartrams—a history propelled by Bartram descendants who gathered at the site in 1893 for a reunion and who formerly established the John Bartram Association by constitution in 1895. The first sentences of the preamble read:

More than a century and a half ago John Bartram planted on the banks of the Schuylkill the first American Botanical Garden. Here, for nearly half a century, with persevering industry and loving care he collected a great variety of rare and valuable trees and plants. In the midst stood the commodious mansion, particularly interesting in the fact that up it the botanist left traces of his own handiwork.¹³⁶

This passage indicates that—like many of their contemporaries newly interested in family nostalgia and American history—the late-nineteenth-century Bartram enthusiasts were obsessed the primacy and heroification. Their sentiment was echoed popularly in the local press of 1889, which was clearly worried that the Bartram legacy was unknown:

As many of our readers are probably not aware of such a distinguished spot in the suburbs of Philadelphia, the eminent position held by the founder of this garden and his popularity both in American and abroad, it may be worth while to briefly define some of the characteristics and associations incident to this man, whom Linnaeus justly styled 'The greatest living botanist of the day.'¹³⁷

¹³⁴City Ordinances, 2 July 1888 and 12 March 1889, tss. by George B. McCracken, Real Estate Officer, City of Philadelphia, 2 June 1938, Fairmount Park Commission, Memorial Hall.

¹³⁵Halpern, part III, 128.

¹³⁶John Bartram Association, "Constitution of the John Bartram Association," 1895, 1898–1904, JBBSC, miscellaneous box #2.

¹³⁷William M. Hayes, "John Bartram's Garden: A Neglected Memorial of a Famous Botanist," *Philadelphia Public Ledger*, 5 February 1889, 3.

Despite obvious interest in the site both by the family and the public, under city ownership the house and gardens were woefully maintained and early in the twentieth century the John Bartram Association took it upon itself ask the city to appropriate \$10,000 for drainage, walk, top soil, new trees, and to plant species known to have been there during Bartram's lifetime.¹³⁸ Monetary woes regarding upkeep were a dire part of the site's problems until the 1920s when oversight of the property was transferred to the Fairmount Park Commission (1923); a project for the first major restoration of the house and grounds had been in progress since 1919 under the auspices of Horace Wells Sellers and the Committee on Preservation of Historic Monuments of the Philadelphia Chapter of the American Institute of Architects.¹³⁹ The restoration itself probably did not occur until after 1922 as a newspaper article from that year noted:

Famous House, Once Show Place, Now Shuttered and Bolted, Further
Marred by Inquisitive Architect... Holes, some of them a foot in diameter,
have been punched in the walls, and floor boards have been torn up by
an inquisitive architect, who desired first-hand information as to the
construction of the house.¹⁴⁰

The "inquisitive architect" mentioned was likely Ralph L. Colton and the "damage" wrought on the house part of his field work at the site. Colton was responsible for the proposed restoration plan submitted to the Committee on Preservation of Historic Monuments of the Philadelphia Chapter of the American Institute of Architects.

The restoration was completed in 1926 in anticipation of the sesquicentennial celebrations in Philadelphia, was part of a larger movement in America whereby large collections of Americana and many historic buildings were put on display for the benefit of the public. In the 1920s and 1930s "a considerable amount of historic preservation occurred—along with some questionable reconstructions, a fair number of transplanted structures, and a few phony ones with flimsy historical pedigrees."¹⁴¹ Perhaps it was the relatively unadulterated state of the John Bartram House that led to a comparatively gentle restoration in terms of conjectural interpretation. On account of a caretaker/ groundskeeper in-residence, the dwelling had never been consistently open to the public, although the John Bartram Association attempted to interpret some of the first-floor rooms early in the 1900s. These furnishings were apparently in deplorable condition by 1922 and their replacement and the reinterpretation of the house's rooms made integral in planning for the its public viewing.¹⁴² As late as April 23, 1929 the John Bartram Association was still acquiring

¹³⁸Minutes, Executive Committee of the John Bartram Association, 10 November 1902, JBBSCCL, Dr. John Bowman Bartram Collection.

¹³⁹Fry, "Phase I...", 146, for property transfer. "City Will Fully Restore Old Bartram Mansion," *The Evening Bulletin*?, 3 May 1919, JBBSCCL.

¹⁴⁰*Philadelphia Public Ledger*, 7 August 1922, JBBSCCL.

¹⁴¹Michael Kammen, *Mystic Chords of Memory: The Transformation of Tradition in American Culture* (New York: Vintage Books, 1993), 342.

¹⁴²*Ledger*, 7 August 1922.

new furniture and the house was not opened to the public until May 1929.¹⁴³ This restoration of the John Bartram House reflected local understanding of the site, however, after the establishment of the Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) in 1933 the site was included in some of the earliest national documentation efforts taken-on by the federal program. Early in the 1940s, the building's measured drawings made in anticipation of the 1920s restoration were redrawn and became part of the national recordation program instituted with HABS.

Activity at the site remained restrained until after World War II, when sentiment leaned towards another restoration and a new comprehensive site plan.¹⁴⁴ These plans were proposed in contrast to the continued expansion of industry along the lower Schuylkill River in the period directly preceding and following World War II. Bartram's Garden was bounded by industrial complexes to the north and south, and a large government worker housing complex and railroad tracks west of the property further isolated the site. By 1953, priorities related to grounds/house management included:

Urgently needed repairs to the house and its dependent buildings, the protective fencing of the Garden proper, and the supplying of modern and adequate toilet facilities as a first step in the program...[and] to prepare a development and maintenance program for the restoration and improvement of the John Bartram House and Garden.¹⁴⁵

Around the same time, furnishings purchased for the house late in the 1920s and early in the 1930s were deemed unacceptable—"what seemed adequate...in the 1930's now looks bare and uninteresting."¹⁴⁶ Another interpretation of the house's rooms was called for, but not implemented at the time.

Renewed interest in the site and its upkeep is better understood within the period context of public history. The dislocation of World War II and the victory of the allies fueled an interest in a glorified American past—not unlike the widespread sentiment present late in the nineteenth century. However, this time around historic sites became viewed as shining examples of national greatness and patriotism, rather than merely parts of an effort to legitimize the history of the United States. Bartram's Garden was not isolated from this type of sentiment. As noted in 1953:

Mr. West announced that he had been approached by members of the Philadelphia Chapter of the American Society of Landscape Architects who had interest in making the Bartram House and Garden a National Shrine... Mr. Bush-Brown... added that in his opinion, such houses and sites as had historical interest must be preserved and publicized if future generations were to understand the high purpose and determination of the men who built this nation. He further pointed out that

¹⁴³Minutes of the John Bartram Association (hereafter MJBA), 11 December 1928, 23 April 1929, JBBSCCL.

¹⁴⁴For more information please consult development plans for the site housed at the JBBSCCL and at the Fairmount Park Commission, Memorial Hall.

¹⁴⁵MJBA, 23 November 1953.

¹⁴⁶MJBA, 8 June 1954.

JOHN BARTRAM HOUSE AND GARDEN,
HOUSE

HALS No. PA-1-A (Page 46)

many of the older people today were somewhat familiar with the tradition and history of their localities, but that the extraordinarily swift changes of recent years and the shift in population made it practically impossible for young people to have such knowledge. He added that the work and example of men like John Bartram had not only an historical interest but a true spiritual value.¹⁴⁷

With patriotism again in fashion, visits to historic sites soared, particularly with the widespread availability of inexpensive automobiles and the construction of vast highway networks. The John Bartram Association minutes in 1953 noted that the group had “secured favorable publicity from the Keystone Automobile Club.”¹⁴⁸ Six years later the *Ford Times*, a monthly publication issued by the Ford Motor Company, highlighted Bartram’s Garden as a pleasurable day trip while in Philadelphia.¹⁴⁹ With increased visitation and national recognition, Bartram’s Garden received one of the highest honors available to historic sites in the United States. At ceremonies held on June 8, 1965 the John Bartram House was designated a National Historic Landmark.¹⁵⁰

Since 1965, activity at Historic Bartram’s Gardens has steadily increased. Dramatic changes within the discipline of history and related fields have contributed vastly to greater understanding of the site, its buildings, its plantings, its past inhabitants, and its meanings over time. A second major restoration was completed in 1980 and current conservation work is targeting rising damp in the cellars, the exterior stonework, and window and glass rehabilitation. Archaeological studies throughout the property are ongoing and have provided particularly insightful information regarding the form of the historic landscape. An active education program targets school-age children and introduces them to aspects of eighteenth-century American life. As it has for the past century, Bartram’s Garden as a site of history and nostalgia continues to captivate professionals and visitors alike and benefit from prevailing trends in scholarship and popular memory.

The Myth of the Swedish Stone Core

As proposed in the “original plans and construction” section of this report, the core of the John Bartram House does not include a Swedish masonry dwelling. It is important to discern when this myth was incorporated into the house’s history as it drove scholarship about the house for over a century. The documentary record does not support the notion. There are no eighteenth-century comments by any of the visitors to the house and gardens noting a core, rather they only state that John

¹⁴⁷MJBA, 9 June 1953.

¹⁴⁸*Ibid.*

¹⁴⁹Ben Eisenstat, “Bartram House and Gardens,” *Ford Times* 51:5 (May 1959): 47–51.

¹⁵⁰George B. Hartzog, Director of National Park Service to Frederic Mann, City Representative and Director of Commerce, City of Philadelphia, 11 February 1965, Fairmount Park Commission, Memorial Hall.

Bartram himself was responsible for the dwelling. The earliest biographical sketch of Bartram's life was written by his son, William, in 1804.¹⁵¹ William Bartram does not deeply elaborate on the house's construction:

He purchased a convenient piece of ground, on the banks of the Schuylkill, at the distance of about three miles from Philadelphia; a happy situation, possessing every soil and exposure, adapted to the various nature of vegetables. Here he built, with his own hands, a large and comfortable house of hewn stone, and laid out a garden containing about five acres of ground.¹⁵²

The next major work regarding the Bartrams, William Darlington's *Memorials of John Bartram and Humphery Marshall* (1849), provides transcriptions of correspondence and includes small biographical and related essays. The essay on Bartram merely reproduces nearly all of William Bartram's 1804 account of his father. In February 1880, *Harper's New Monthly Magazine* ran an article entitled "Bartram and His Garden"—in reference to the house's construction it merely stated that "the stones of which were hewn from the solid rock and the house was built by the naturalist's own house; for among his other accomplishments he reckoned that of practical stone-mason."¹⁵³ An article five years later noted that Bartram "began building there [the land purchased in 1728] in 1730, in a quaint old-fashioned style of architecture, a house of hewn stone."¹⁵⁴ For the period, most newspaper articles reviewed tend to describe the house and its history simply—giving dates matching those in the two date stones, 1731 and 1770, and noting that Bartram constructed the house of "hewn stone" cut by his own hands. In the second half of the 1880s, only after interest in the site was reawakened through a coalition of Bartram descendents and other interested individuals, some notation that the house contained a Swedish core began to surface in the written record.

It appears that one of the strongest advocates for the Swedish core was William Middleton Bartram (1838–1916), a great-great grandson of John Bartram. As perhaps one of the last Bartrams born at the old house and one of the most active members of the John Bartram Association, W. M. Bartram became the authority on Bartram-related history.¹⁵⁵ An article in the *Philadelphia Press* penned in 1895, the year that the "John Bartram Association" was formally organized, referred directly to an "old Swedish Building." It is believed that the text was drawn from an address given by W. M. Bartram and concisely sums up his view of the house's history.¹⁵⁶ The article noted that the house present on the property when Bartram purchased it was:

¹⁵¹William Bartram, "Some Account of the late Mr. John Bartram, of Pennsylvania," *Philadelphia Medical and Physical Journal* 1:2 (1804): 115–124.

¹⁵²*Ibid.*, 118.

¹⁵³"Bartram and His Garden," *Harper's New Monthly Magazine* 60 (February 1880): 323.

¹⁵⁴Harry G. Parker, "Bartram's Gardens," *The Young Oologist* 2:1 (May 1885): 1.

¹⁵⁵Joel T. Fry, Curator of Historic Collections, Historic Bartram's Garden, to author, electronic correspondence, 2 November 2001.

¹⁵⁶William M. Bartram, "Early History of the Bartram Garden Tract," mss. JBSCL, Elisabeth H. Cadbury Collection. Additionally, there is a diagram of the house's evolution based on W. M. Bartram's recollections included in Colton, "Bartram's House..."

Built of stone one and a half stories high, with but two rooms, one on the ground floor, with a cellar beneath, and a small room on the second floor. In the year 1730 he made an addition to the house, raising the old Swedish building higher and expanding it south; it then contained six rooms.¹⁵⁷

The small 1907 publication issued by the John Bartram Association further corroborated this take on the house; “when John Bartram bought the property, the house upon the place consisted of the kitchen that has the big fireplace and a half story above that.”¹⁵⁸ By this year, the stance taken by the people interpreting the site argued for a “Swedish stone core,” however some of the architectural publications early in the twentieth century did not necessarily forward this sentiment.

Frank Cousins and Phil Riley’s *The Colonial Architecture of Philadelphia* (1920) briefly noted in its section on “Hewn Stone Country Houses” that the “curious structure was begun in 1730, and the main part of it was completed the following year.”¹⁵⁹ Fiske Kimball’s seminal *Domestic Architecture of the American Colonies and of the Early Republic* (1922) fails to mention the house at all; it does, however, note that the American log house first appeared in the colonies as the “customary form of dwelling” for the Swedes and Finns.¹⁶⁰ Despite these views, later discussions of the structure’s chronology—including those ranging from Emily Read Cheston’s *John*

Bartram, 1699–1777, His Garden and His House (1938, 1953) to David Laskin’s “Landscape: The King’s Botanist” from a January/February 2000 edition of *Preservation*—have been shaped by the “myth of the Swedish stone core.”

Thus, it is entirely conceivable that like many of their contemporaries newly interested in American history and hung up on primacy, the late-nineteenth-century Bartram enthusiasts—led by William Middleton Bartram—crafted an unsubstantiated architectural history based on a Swedish stone core. The amateur historians found deeds ultimately linking the Bartram property to the Swedes and containing a “messuage or tenement,” that, in their minds, was constructed of stone and became the base of the extant Bartram house. This historical construction—so to speak—propelled thinking about the house’s past for over a century. Elimination

¹⁵⁷“The Bartram Family: Original Home of John Bartram,” *Philadelphia Press*, 27 November 1895.

¹⁵⁸John Bartram Association, *Bartram’s Garden, Philadelphia, Pa.* (Philadelphia: John Jos. McVey, Publisher, 1907), 37. This booklet was issued in three editions—1904, 1907, and 1915. The differences between them generally rested in the topics covered and illustrations included rather than in their historical tone, which did not vary. Joel T. Fry, Curator of Historic Collections, Historic Bartram’s Garden, believes Elizabeth O. Abbot—given as the author in the 1915 edition—is responsible for the text of all three publications.

¹⁵⁹Frank Cousins and Phil M. Riley, *The Colonial Architecture of Philadelphia* (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1920), 93.

¹⁶⁰Fiske Kimball, *Domestic Architecture of the American Colonies and of the Early Republic* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1922), 8.

of this physical core does not greatly change the Swedish history associated with the site as any evidence of an associated stone structure would have been nearly obliterated through John Bartram's extensive and protracted construction at the site.

PART II: ARCHITECTURAL INFORMATION¹⁶¹

A. General Statement:

1. Architectural character: The John Bartram House is a significant surviving eighteenth-century example of an aggrandized rural farmhouse. The east façade—with its near symmetry, classical elements, and regularized stonework—easily references high-style architectural fashion visible in period country estates of Philadelphia's gentry. Behind this fine river front, however, rubble stonework, an uncomplicated plan, and comparatively simple interior finishes communicate the house's vernacular form and construction. Similarly, as a year-round residence at the center of a working farm and botanical garden, the house was more the site of mundane household activities than seasonal entertainment and escape. The extant house largely resulted from a series of self-contained campaigns and smaller additions and changes spanning four decades in the eighteenth century.
2. Condition of fabric: Very good.

B. Description of Exterior:

1. Overall dimensions: The central two-and-one-half story portion of the edifice measures approximately 54'-4" x 26'-9". There are two one-story shed roof additions extending from the north and south walls. The overall building perimeter measures roughly 73'-5" x 26'-9".

Foundations: The foundations are constructed of Wissahickon schist and gneiss and range in thickness from 1'-3" to 1'-6". The walls are constructed of random-coursed rubble stone, though the cellars under the parlor and the study are made up of somewhat more regularly cut and coursed stone. A large stone relieving arch approximately 8'-0" x 6'-0" x 4'-6" provides support for the four central fireplaces and flues.

3. Walls: With the exception of the conservatory's south wall—which is of brick—and the north wall of the northern shed addition—which is frame—all of the exterior walls are load-bearing and constructed of Wissahickon schist and gneiss.

East Facade: Facing the Schuylkill River, this exterior face displays high-quality stonework whose parts are arranged formally and with near-

¹⁶¹Summer 2001 photographs of the John Bartram House are located with the field notes.

symmetry. The first two floors are organized into four bays such that a two-bay recessed portico is flanked by single bay “ells” on either side. The three third-floor dormers are centered over the windows of the end bays and the central portico column. The central block is constructed of ashlar-coursed blocks of rock-faced Wissahickon stone. The portico is defined by three Ionic columns—two semi-engaged and one free-standing—set on square pedestals. The right column sits on a square plinth and the two others sit on round plinths.¹⁶² A water table extends 0'-2" beyond the wall plane across the front at the same height of the portico floor (approximately 1'-11"). A beltcourse is present between the first and second stories and the corners are accentuated by stone quoins with beveled edges. The columns, water table, beltcourse, and quoins are not of dressed stone, but rather made up of the same rock-faced stone as the rest of the wall. The portico's second story is enclosed with a frame wall sheathed in weatherboards.

Two single-story shed roofed additions extend to the north and the south. The east face of the northern shed is of rubble stone coated in a thin layer of worn stucco; it is pierced by a small window. A small fragment of Doric frieze—composed of two triglyphs and two vaguely floral patterns in relief—is imbedded upside-down in the northwest corner of the shed about 6'-0" from ground level. The southern shed is more finely crafted. Its east face is made up of irregularly sized stones laid in comparatively regular courses. At the southeast corner brick from the shed's south wall is neatly keyed into the stone east wall.

West Elevation: The first two stories of the central section are composed of rubble-coursed stone covered in two generations of roughcast. While not having a formal arrangement like the east façade, the west face is still regularized. The three first-floor windows are in alignment with those at the second floor. While spaced and centered in reference to the roof plane, the third-floor dormers are also more-or-less aligned with the openings below.

The west wall of the northern shed has similar attributes as the east wall. The west conservatory wall is mostly of irregular stones laid-up in a manner less regularized than the east front. The shed's southwest corner is of stone on the bottom and brick at the top where the south wall is neatly keyed into the west wall.

North Elevation: The gable wall is of rubble-coursed stone up to the roof and covered in a worn layer of stucco. The quoining at the northeast corner is visible on this wall. A chimney stack—covered in stucco with a decorative brick band near the top—extends upward from this wall and is off-center

¹⁶²Two carved square plinths—one presently located in a garden retaining wall and the other in a foundation wall for the Seed House—indicate that Bartram may have initially desired all three columns to have squared bases, and later changed to the more “classically appropriate” round bases.

slightly to the west. Four windows—two on the second floor and two on the third floor—are symmetrically placed in the wall. The north wall of the shed is covered with tightly-fitting horizontal boards; two symmetrically-placed battened doors access the men's and women's bathroom facilities. A stone drip course extends across the wall of the main block just above the shed's roof.

South Elevation: The gable wall is of rubble-coursed stone up to the roof and covered in a worn layer of stucco. Like the north wall, the decorative quoins wrap around the building's southeast corner. A stone outcropping (constructed either as a drip course or the support for an eliminated pent eave) extends across the wall between the second and the third stories. The west window on the third floor is topped by a large lintel date stone. The conservatory's south wall is made up of a stone base extending roughly 1'-6" from the ground at the southeast corner and at grade on the southwest. A central door is flanked by two large windows set in brick.

4. Structural systems, framing:

All of the major exterior and a number of the interior walls are of load-bearing stone. The floor joists on the three floors run east to west and are pocketed into the stone walls on the first two floors. On the third floor, the joists have outriggers at both ends which rest on the top of the stone walls and a large timber along the porch chamber's east wall. Pairs of steel posts topped by I-beams run from north to south in the cellar under the study, parlor, and hall. The roof structure encompasses both the third floor and the small attic space above and is comprised of common rafters pegged at the apex; there is no ridge beam. Intermediary timbers extend up into the attic space between the rafter pairs, they were necessary for the lathing and plastering of the third-floor rooms.

5. Openings:

- a. Doors and doorways: Four doors open onto the east-facing portico. Two sets of double doors in the east wall have five panels in each door on the exterior and are battened with beaded boards on the interior; they are hung with strap hinges. While similar in execution, these doors have slightly varying dimensions—both overall as well as the panels. The exterior architraves are somewhat obscured by multiple paint layers, however, the molding appears to have quarter-round molding followed by a small cyma reversa both applied to the pegged frame with a beaded corner. Two other doors open onto the portico, one in the north wall and one in the south. The doors have two large panels on the exterior and, similarly to the double doors, battened interior faces with beaded boards. The north door has a similar architrave as the double doors while the door in the south

wall has only a plain pegged frame with beaded corner. Applied to the top of the doorframe is a single strip of unrelated molding with a profile containing a Grecian ovolo followed by a bevel.

There is one door in the west wall. It contains three exterior panels and is of battened construction on the interior face. The conservatory door in the south wall contains fifteen fixed lights with two shallow panels below. The architrave has simple trim with an ovolo applied to a plain frame with a beaded corner. There are two doors on the north wall of the northern shed. They are of battened construction surrounded by plain trim.

- b. Windows, window frames, and shutters: A majority of the windows in the main block of the house (23 of 34) have identical muntin profiles (0'-6/8" wide at the glass and extending out 0'-7/8" from the glass), light dimensions (roughly 0'-9 6/8" x 0'-7 5/8"), and double-hung frame construction. The windows bearing these dimensions include:

East Façade

Nine-over-nine:	first-floor ell windows (2)
Six-over-nine:	upper and lower portico windows (3)
	second-floor ell windows (2)

West Elevation

Six-over-nine:	southern first-floor windows (2)
Six-over-six:	northern first-floor window (1)
	second-floor windows (3)

South Elevation

Six-over-six:	second-floor windows (2)
---------------	--------------------------

North Elevation

Four-over-four:	second-floor windows (2)
-----------------	--------------------------

The third-floor dormer windows—six-over-six (6)—also bear the aforementioned dimensions and differ only in that the tops of their frames are gently rounded. The dormers are weatherboarded on the sides and have a shallow gable framing the window.

The six-over-six double-hung window in the study facing out onto the conservatory has a similar profile to these other windows but is wider. Like the others it extends 0'-7/8" from the glass, however it is considerably wider at 0'-1 3/8"; the dimensions of the lights are slightly smaller than the others.

The third-floor gable windows (4) are six-light single casements; the west window in the south wall has a carved lintel with the inscription. The lintel above the south third-floor window is inscribed with "God Bless" in Greek, over "IOHN&ANN:BARTRAM:1731." The northern shed's east and west windows are paired casements with two lights in each half.

The conservatory's east window is eight-over-eight double-hung and its large south windows are eighteen-over-twenty-four double-hung.

Most of the windows set in masonry have simple pegged frames with interior and exterior corner beads; the west kitchen window has an exterior bevel instead of a bead. The portico window's architrave bears the same molding profile as the flanking doors. With the exception of the parlor and the hall window—which have a Greek ovolo and astragal molding applied to the frame—the west windows have a standard ovolo and astragal profile on their exterior.

The four east-facing windows in the ells have jambs that are bolted through the stone walls and consequently have no exterior wood architraves.

Some of the windows have exterior shutters. The pair on the portico windows contain three raised panels that face outwards when open; the panels' reverse is subtly beveled. The hall and parlor's west shutters also display three raised panels when open, however the panels' reverse is flush with the rails and stiles. The kitchen window shutters do not have raised panels on either surface, likewise, the large southern conservatory windows have plain panels that are flush with the rails and stiles. All of the exterior shutters are hung with strap hinges.

6. Stone carving and woodwork:

Perhaps the most engaging feature of the house is its elaborately carved east window frames. As already noted, the water table, quoins, beltcourse, and columns on the east front, while neatly cut, are not fully dressed and finished, although the quoins are nicely beveled. The capitals and bases of the Ionic columns—though simple—necessitated a carver's skill, as did the elaborate stone window frames. The capitals bear the requisite scrolls with lines of dentils in-between; delicate foliate bands are carved on the sides of the capitals.

Each window frame—jambs, lintel, and sill—is essentially composed of four single slabs of stone with carved outer edges. With the exception of a carved text panel below the southern ell's second-floor window, the vertical

arrangement of carved parts is the same in both ells. The first-floor windows' frames are crossetted at the top and spiral inward at the bottom. The frames on the second floor are crossetted and have rounded tops; they curve 90° outward at the bottom.

On the portico's first floor the north set of double doors is topped by a simple carved lintel. The adjacent pantry door also has a lintel bearing a symmetrical pattern of abstracted waves

Both the east and west walls are topped by bed molds. The east mold is composed of a Grecian ovolo, cavetto, and a squared-off set-back. The west mold is dominated by a large cyma recta extending upward from a smaller cyma recta. The gables are trimmed with plain boards with a beaded corner at the roofline.

7. Roof: The main roof has a simple two-plane gable profile and is sheathed in wood shingles, as are the six dormers piercing the roof. The northern and southern additions have shed roofs that are covered in metal. The present shingles date from 1975.¹⁶³

C. Description of Interior:

1. The rectilinear house proper contains five and six rooms, respectively, on the first and second floors; three on the west side stacked one over another, one on each floor in the north and south ells, and one over the east-facing porch.

While originally a hall-parlor house, with later additions the hall portion of the initial dwelling became a circulation space. The second floor was arranged around a passage from the beginning.

2. Flooring: The present floors represent many different generations and are made up variously of pine, chestnut, and oak planks. Many of the rooms had floorboards replaced as part of the 1926 restoration, particularly on the first floor, though planks survive from the eighteenth century, for example in the parlor chamber (ca. 1731) and the study (ca. 1770). The difference in grade between the hall and parlor has occurred during one or more periods of change or restoration.
3. Wall and ceiling finish: There are plastered walls and ceilings in the rooms on all three floors. The kitchen's ceiling is not plastered, the hewn joists and kitchen- chamber floorboards are visible.

¹⁶³Bartram's Maintenance Folder, 1975, Fairmount Park Commission, Memorial Hall.

4. Doorways and doors:

There are varied generations of interior doors and a number of “odd” doors unrelated to these groupings. The doors believed to make the up the earliest generation are those between the hall and parlor and the upstairs passage and the parlor chamber. They have finished fronts with three panels bearing a simple raised profile and lightly beveled backs. Originally hung with strap hinges, the first-floor door now has five-part butt hinges. The closet door in the parlor and the corner cupboard also bear this type of construction. A second generation of doors includes paneled doors in the second floor passage for a closet, the door to the third-floor stairs, and the hall chamber. These doors are similar to the first generation in profile but do not have beveled backs. A third generation of doors have slightly more intricate panel profiles—with quarter-round molding around the raised panel—and plain backs. The study and porch chamber doors are made up of four large rectangular panels and hung with H-L hinges. The raised panel profile visible on these doors is also present on the glass closet doors of the kitchen chamber, the glass closet doors of the study chamber, and the closet doors of the porch chamber. The third-floor has six battened doors constructed of beaded planks. The two middle rooms on the third floor, the door between the hall chamber and the passage, the porch chamber door, the door between the kitchen chamber and ell room, and the door between the kitchen and the pantry are all topped by three-light fixed transoms with varied muntin profiles. Evidence suggests that the interior study door most likely had one originally as well.

5. Trim and woodwork:

Beyond the doors, the trim and woodwork in the house are restricted to certain areas. The stair has a square newel post topped by a spherical newel cap; the balusters are rectangular with coved corners. The parlor and parlor chamber have paneled chimney breasts arranged around glass closet doors. A paneled closet is incorporated into the fireplace wall of the parlor. The chimney breast and the fireplace wall of the kitchen chamber is fully paneled. A chair rail extends around the room on west and north two walls and a large cornice at the ceiling along the north and east walls. The porch chamber has a paneled south wall, a chair rail on the east and west walls, and a beaded structural timber along the top of the east wall. All of the wooden partition walls throughout the house are about 0⁷-1” thick and are of beaded boards.

6. Mechanical:

Heating: Until the 1920s, the house was warmed by means of fireplace and stove. A furnace and flues connected to round registers on the first floor was added as part of the 1920s restoration. The furnace was replaced with

the 1980 restoration and additional heating and air-conditioning equipment added at this time on the third-floor and in the attic, and new ventilation ducts placed throughout the house.

Plumbing: There is no indication that the house was ever plumbed for gas. While outhouses were present in the public park since at least the 1920s and regularly moved to new pits, by 1954 these were seen as woefully inadequate.

At the present sanitary facilities for the public and staff, if not original, are authentic reproductions appropriate for the period of the house, it is felt that modern arranges should be built in the one story stone shed attached to the north end of the house, to economically make use of existing water supply and drainage.¹⁶⁴

New bathrooms were installed by 1956, utilizing an existing septic system. The water and sewer systems for the site were not hooked-up to municipal utility lines until the mid-1990s. With the exception of a water line for the air conditioner, no other plumbing is present in the house.

Electricity: The first and second stories have never received extensive wiring for electrical outlets and lights. The house may have been wired since the 1926 restoration, however, the bulk of the current wiring stems from the 1980 restoration and after. These changes introduced new heating and air conditioning equipment and wiring in the third-floor offices.

D. Site:

1. Historic landscape design:

By 1739, John Bartram held nearly 300 acres of land in Kingsessing Township. The bulk of this land lay between the Darby road (Woodland Avenue) and the Schuylkill River, however a large portion was also located on the west side of the Darby road. Most of this land was planted with crops, however the acreage in the immediate vicinity of the house included gardens for pleasure, study, and edibles. The 1758 drawing shows a varied landscape extending between the house and the Schuylkill River, separated from the rest of the land by fences and terraced near the dwelling house. The "Common Flower Garden" and "a new Flower Garden" were present at the center and south sides of this terrace. The north side contained the "upper kitchen garden," not surprisingly near the kitchen and utilitarian outbuildings. Below the terrace, an immense kitchen garden that included a pond and milk house took up more than half of the area. East of this garden, two 150-yard "walks" defined by lines of trees extended from the upper terrace to the river.

¹⁶⁴John Bartram Association minutes, 8 June 1954, JBBSCCL.

Despite the regularized features depicted in the drawing, the planted acreage in the house's vicinity was not nearly as engineered as the pleasure gardens of the Philadelphia gentry's country estates. While distinct tree-lined allées were constructed from the house to the river and enclosed flower gardens located on the upper terrace, the garden as a whole was probably not extensively organized. As previously noted, ten years after John Bartram's death, George Washington paid a visit to "the Botanical Garden of Mr. Bartram" and commented that the garden, "tho' stored with many curious plants, shrubs and trees, many of which are exotics was not laid off with much taste nor was it large."¹⁶⁵ Thus, as a botanical garden and—by John Bartram's death—a busy commercial nursery, the grounds were never predominantly "laid-off" in a highly formalized manner.

Very little of John Bartram's landscape and plantings survive with the exception of the upper and lower garden divisions and the south retaining wall. Archaeology pinpointed the location of the pond and allowed for its recreation in the 1990s. The grounds are likely more wooded than in the eighteenth century. It is probable that from its earliest manifestation Bartram's house commanded a picturesque view of the Schuylkill River, and importantly, the river traffic was treated to a view of Bartram's house.

With the City of Philadelphia's purchase late in the nineteenth century, much of the acreage beyond the immediate area around the house was altered and landscaped into a usable city park that includes ball fields, a playground, and a picnic pavilion. More recently, "Bartram Park" has been expanded to the north. The portion of this added acreage located between the river and the railroad tracks was reclaimed from industrial uses and turned into a gravel parking lot and meadow. Former wetlands to the south of the house along the Schuylkill River have also been recreated. The present park acreage stands at 46+ acres.

2. Outbuildings:

The utilitarian outbuildings were most likely arranged early-on to the house's north. The 1758 drawing of the house includes a shed-roofed structure on that side of the house. Of the extant outbuildings, a greenhouse structure (1760–1761) and a large stone bank barn (1775) were constructed during John Bartram's lifetime. See the historical report for the John Bartram House and Garden, Greenhouse, HALS No. PA-1-B, for additional information. Ultimately, a line of stone outbuildings extended north from the greenhouse and others were arranged with the bank barn around an

¹⁶⁵Earnest, 162-163. It is uncertain which "Mr. Bartram" Washington refers to in this passage. It is possible that he meant, honorifically, John Bartram, Sr., however, it is more likely that the person was either John Bartram, Jr., by 1787 the proprietor of the botanical garden and nursery, or his intellectual brother William Bartram who had again taken up permanent residence in their childhood house.

enclosed farm court. Most of the extant outbuildings have uncertain construction dates. Portions may have been built in the eighteenth century and later expanded in the nineteenth century, others were newly constructed in the nineteenth century. Additionally, a number of glasshouses were once located on the site, at least two of which stood immediately south of and essentially integral to the outbuildings. Presently, these outbuildings have been rehabilitated and expanded for site and organizational use and included offices, a library, classrooms, a gift shop, catering facilities, restrooms, and storage.

Along the bank of the Schuylkill River, a large stone survives that is clearly shaped for milling cider. No documentary sources confirm whether John Bartram was responsible for the press, however as a some-time stone worker he clearly had the skills to carve it. The cider press is now enclosed by an iron fence.

PART III: SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Works Consulted

Published Works

"Bartram and His Garden." Harper's New Monthly Magazine 60 (February 1880): 321-330.

Bartram, William. "Some Account of the Late Mr. John Bartram, of Pennsylvania." Philadelphia Medical and Physical Journal 1:2 (1804): 115-124.

"Bartram's Garden." The Public Ledger, 16 March 1891.

Berkeley, Edmund, and Dorothy Smith Berkeley. The Life and Travels of John Bartram: From Lake Ontario to the River St. John. Tallahassee: University Presses of Florida, 1982.

Bushman, Richard L. The Refinement of America: Persons, Houses, Cities. New York: Vintage Books, 1992.

The Correspondence of John Bartram, 1734-1777, ed. Edmund Berkeley and Dorothy Smith Berkeley. Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida, 1992.

Cotter, John L., Daniel G. Roberts, and Michael Parrington. The Buried Past: An Archaeological History of Philadelphia. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1992.

Cousins, Frank, and Phil M. Riley. The Colonial Architecture of Philadelphia. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1920.

- Craig, Peter Stebbins. The 1693 Census of the Swedes on the Delaware. Winter Park, FL: SAG Publications, 1993.
- Craig, Peter Stebbins. "The Yocums of Aronameck in Philadelphia, 1648-1702." National Genealogical Society Quarterly 71:4 (December 1983): 243-279.
- de Crèvecoeur, J. Hector St. John. "Letter: From Mr. Iw-n Al-z, a Russian Gentleman, Describing the Visit He Paid at My Request to Mr. John Bertram, the Celebrated Pennsylvanian Botanist." In Letters from an American Farmer and Sketches of Eighteenth-Century America, 187-201. London, 1782. Reprint, Gloucester, MA: Peter Smith, 1968.
- Cromley, Elizabeth Collins. "A History of American Beds and Bedrooms." In Perspectives in Vernacular Architecture, IV, ed. Thomas Carter and Bernard L. Herman, 177-186. Columbia, MO: University of Missouri Press for the Vernacular Architecture Forum, 1991.
- Darlington, William. Memorials of John Bartram and Humphry Marshall, With Notices of their Botanical Contemporaries. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston, 1849.
- Earnest, Ernest. John and William Bartram: Botanists and Explorers: 1699-1777, 1739-1823. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1940.
- Eisenstat, Ben. "Bartram House and Gardens." Ford Times 51:5 (May 1959): 47-51.
- [Fox, R. Hingston]. "The Religious Views of John Bartram, the Great Botanist, and His Disownment by Darby Monthly Meeting of Friends, in 1758." August 1915. Mss. Historical Society of Pennsylvania.
- Hayes, William M. "John Bartram's Garden: A Neglected Memorial of a Famous Botanist." Philadelphia Public Ledger, 5 February 1889.
- Harshberger, John W. The Botanists of Philadelphia and Their Work. Philadelphia, 1899.
- John and William Bartram's America: Selections from the Writings of the Philadelphia Naturalists, ed. Helen Gere Cruickshank. New York: The Devin-Adair Company, 1957.
- John Bartram Association. Bartram's Garden, Philadelphia, Pa. Philadelphia: John Jos. McVey, Publisher, 1907.
- Jordan, Terry G. "The Material Cultural Legacy of New Sweden on the American Frontier." In New Sweden in America, ed. Carol E. Hoffecker, Richard Waldron, Lorraine E. Williams, and Barbara E. Benson, 302-318. Newark, DE: University of Delaware Press, 1995.

Kalm, Peter. Travels into North America. 2 Vols. Trans. John Reinhold Forster. London, 1772.

Kammen, Michael. Mystic Chords of Memory: The Transformation of Tradition in American Culture. New York: Vintage Books, 1993.

Kimball, Fiske. Domestic Architecture of the American Colonies and of the Early Republic. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1922.

Laskin, David. "Landscape: The King's Botanist." Preservation 52:1 (January/February 2000): 66-71.

Parker, Harry G. "Bartram's Gardens." The Young Oologist 2:1 (May 1885): 1.

Riley, Edward M. "The Independence Hall Group." Historic Philadelphia: From the Founding until the Early Nineteenth Century, Papers Dealing with its people and Buildings with an Illustrative Map, 7-42. Philadelphia, 1953. Issued as Transactions of the American Philosophical Society 43, Pt1 (1953).

Scheik, William J. "Telling A Wonder: Dialectic in the Writings of John Bartram." Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography 107:2 (1983): 235-248.

Slaughter, Thomas P. The Natures of John and William Bartram. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1996.

Taussig, Harold E. "Deism in Philadelphia during the Age of Franklin." Pennsylvania History 37:3 (1970): 217-236.

Ware, Isaac. The Four Books of Palladio's Architecture. London, 1738. Reprint New York: Dover Publications, Inc., 1965.

John Bowman Bartram Special Collections Library

Caroline B. West Collection. (various materials)

Colton, R[alph] L., for the Committee on Preservation of Historic Monuments of the Philadelphia Chapter of the American Institute of Architects. "Bartram's House, Kingsessing, Philadelphia: Summary of Survey Preliminary to Restoration by the City of Philadelphia." Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1925.

Constitution of the John Bartram Association. 1895. Revised 1898-1904.

Dr. John B. Bartram Collection. (various materials)

Eastwick, Joseph L. "Speech Given at the John Bartram Colonial Evening." 25 September 1982. Tss.

Frens and Frens, LLC, et al. "Comprehensive Conservation Study for the John Bartram House, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania." 1999.

Fry, Joel T. "Benjamin Franklin and the Pennsylvania Fireplace: A History and a New Example from Bartram's Garden." Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1987. Revised 1991.

Fry, Joel T. "Phase I Archaeological Survey of the Proposed Wetland Restoration Site: Historic Bartram's Garden." Vol. 1. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1996.

Glenn, Marsha L., for John M. Dickey. "Historic Structures Report, The John Bartram House." 2 Vols. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1978.

Halpern, Martha Crary. "Man's Use and Love of Nature." 3 Vols. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1990.

Inventory of Isaac Bartram's Estate. 5 May 1708. Tss.

"John Bartram's Garden: A Neglected Memorial of a Famous Botanist." ca. 1889. Mss. Elisabeth H. Cadbury Collection.

Kenyon, Jeff L., Stan M. Hunter, and Helen Schenck. "Basic Historic Research and Archaeological Feasibility Study of Bartram Park." Museum Historic Research Center. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 1975.

Minutes of the John Bartram Association. 1928–1964.

Smith, Merrill D. "The Bartram Women: Farm Wives, Artists, Botanists, and Entrepreneurs." Bartram Broadside (Winter 2001): 1–11.

Stebbins, Peter Craig. "Memorandum to Joel T. Fry, Curator of Historic Collections, Historic Bartram's Garden." Washington, D.C. 7 April 1999.

Whiting, Winslow. "Charles H. Eastwick." January 1963. Tss.

Miscellaneous

"Bartram Park Expansion." Mss. Fairmount Park Commission, Memorial Hall.

Cahill, William Daniel. "William Bartram and the Romance of Learning: A Study in Eighteenth-Century American Education." Diss. Rutgers University, 2001.

City Ordinance. 2 July 1888. Tss. Fairmount Park Commission, Memorial Hall.

City Ordinance. 12 March 1889. Tss. Fairmount Park Commission, Memorial Hall.

City Ordinance. 22 December 1980. Mss. Fairmount Park Commission, Memorial Hall.

Deed. Mouns Johannes to Frederick Schobbenhousen. 9 June 1712.

Deed. Owen Owen to John Bartram. 30 September 1728.

Deed. Warner Company to the City of Philadelphia. 9 February 1981.

Ground Rent Agreement. F. W. Bacon et Ux to Warner Company. 12 April 1929.

Inventory of Estate of John Bartram, Deceased. 18 September 1779.

Knight, C. R., Surveyor. Philadelphia Contributorship. Policy No. 9119. 22 September 1854.

Last Will and Testament of John Bartram. 17 January 1772.

Letter. George B. Hartzog, Director of National Park Service to Frederic Mann, City Representative and Director of Commerce, City of Philadelphia. 11 February 1965. Mss. Fairmount Park Commission, Memorial Hall.

Long, Timothy Preston. "The Woodlands: A 'Matchless Place'." Thesis. University of Pennsylvania, 1991.

1798 Direct Tax Schedules. 1st Division, 4th Assessment District.

Smith, Carl T. "Abstracted Land & Probate Records Pertaining to Early Kingessing Township." ca. 1977. Mss., Historical Society of Pennsylvania.

U.S. Decennial Censuses. Population Schedules, 1790, 1800, 1810, 1820, 1830.

Visuals

Architectural Drawings. The Athenaeum of Philadelphia.

Architectural Drawings. Fairmount Park Commission, Memorial Hall.

Architectural Drawings. John Bowman Bartram Special Collections Library.

Original copy of the 1758 draught of the house and garden is located in the Early of Darby Collection, Knowsley Hall, near Liverpool, England. Duplicates are located in the John Bowman Bartram Special Collections Library.

Photographic Files. John Bowman Bartram Special Collections Library.

JOHN BARTRAM HOUSE AND GARDEN,
HOUSE

HALS No. PA-1-A (Page 63)

PART IV: PROJECT INFORMATION

The project was co-sponsored by the Historic American Buildings Survey (HABS) of the National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, as a pilot project for a new program, the Historic American Landscapes Survey (HALS); the John Bartram Association, Sidney Spahr, President; Historic Bartram's Garden, Timothy A. Storbeck, Acting Director; and the Getty Grant Program, part of the J. Paul Getty Trust. Research assistance and other support provided by Joel T. Fry, Curator of Historic Collections, and the resident staff of Historic Bartram's Garden. The documentation of the John Bartram House was undertaken by the Historic American Buildings Survey, E. Blaine Cliver, Chief of HABS/HAER/HALS; under the direction of Paul D. Dolinsky, Chief of HABS, Acting Chief of HALS. The project leaders were HABS architect Robert R. Arzola and HABS historian Catherine C. Lavoie. The project was completed during the Summer of 2001 at Historic Bartram's Garden, Philadelphia, by project supervisor Mary Ellen Strain, architect, Philadelphia; architecture technicians Kathryn A. Falwell (Tulane University) and Kelton H. Villavicencio (ICOMOS international intern—Nicaragua). The project historian was James A. Jacobs (HABS/The George Washington University). The large-format photography was produced by Joseph Elliott.